

THE  
LONDON REVIEW,  
FOR OCTOBER, 1776.

---

*Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Vol. LXVI. Part I. for the year 1776. 4to. 7s. 6d. Davis.*

THE ROYAL SOCIETY having some time since come to a determination to publish the *philosophical transactions* regularly twice a year, their secretaries must, of course, like the editors of other periodical works, be subjected to a like diversity both in the quantity and quality of the matter contained in their publications. By diversifying, indeed, the size and value of their volumes, they may better accommodate them to their materials, than can the London Reviewers or other monthly editors, who, confined to a certain bulk and price are obliged like the drivers of other diligences, to go their usual stage, with whatever company they can pick up, nay, full or empty, with or without a fare.

If under such circumstances they are not always equally welcome or respectable, it is no wonder. In philosophical researches in particular much depends on accidental discoveries; which are not made every day, even in this teeming age of invention and investigation.

The Contents, of this first part of the volume for the present year, are the following:

“ 1. On the Nature of the Gorgonia; that it is a real Marine Animal, and not of a mixed Nature, between Animal and Vegetable. By John Ellis, Esq. F. R. S. in a Letter to Daniel Solander, M. D. F. R. S.—2. The Variation of the Compass; containing 1719 Observations to, in, and from, the East Indies, Guinea, West Indies, and Mediterranean, with the Latitudes and Longitudes at the Time of Observation. The Longitude for the most Part reckoned from the Meridian of London, if otherwise, it is taken Notice of in the Margin. By Mr. Robert Douglass. Recommended to the Public by the late Dr. Halley. Communicated by the Reverend Nevil Maskelyne, Astronomer Royal, F. R. S. with a Letter prefixed from William Mountaine, Esq. F. R. S. to Mr. Maskelyne.—3. Propositions selected from a Paper on the Division of Right Lines, Surfaces, and Solids. By James Glenie, A. M. of the University of Edinburgh. Communicated by the Astronomer Royal.—4. A new Method of finding Time by equal Altitudes. By Alexander Aubert, Esq. F. R. S.—5. An Account of Falkland Islands. By William Clayton,

VOL. IV.                      I i

Clayton, Esq. of his Majesty's Navy.—6. Short and easy Theorems for finding, in all Cases, the Differences between the Values of Annuities payable Yearly, and of the same Annuities payable Half-yearly, Quarterly, or Monthly. By the Rev. Richard Price, D. D. F. R. S. In a Letter to Sir John Pringle, Bart. P. R. S.—7. An Account of the Romanish Language. By Joseph Planta, F. R. S. In a Letter to Sir John Pringle, Bart. P. R. S.—8. A Supplement to a Paper, entitled, Observations on the Population of Manchester. By Thomas Percival, M. D. F. R. and A. S.—9. Violent Asthmatic Fits, occasioned by the Effluvia of Ipecacoanha. By William Scott, M. D. of Stamfordham, Northumberland.—10. An Account of the Success of some Attempts to freeze Quicksilver, at Albany Fort, in Hudson's Bay, in the Year 1775: with Observations on the Dipping-needle. By Thomas Hutchins, Esq. in a Letter to Dr. Maty, Sec. R. S.—11. Astronomical Observations made in the Austrian Netherlands in 1772 and 1773. By Nathanael Pigott, Esq. F. R. S. Foreign Member of the Academies of Brussels and Caen. In a Letter to the Reverend Nevil Maskelyne, Astronomer Royal, F. R. S.—12. An Account of some Attempts to imitate the Effects of the Torpedo, by Electricity. By the Hon. Henry Cavendish, F. R. S.—13. Observations on Respiration, and the Use of the Blood. By Joseph Priestley, LL. D. F. R. S.—14. Experiments on Water obtained from the melted Ice of Sea-Water, to ascertain whether it be fresh or not; and to determine its specific Gravity with respect to other Water. Also Experiments to find the Degree of Cold in which Sea-Water begins to freeze. By Mr. Edward Nairne. Addressed to Sir John Pringle, Bart. P. R. S.—15. Easy Methods of measuring the Diminution of Bulk, taking place upon the Mixture of common Air and nitrous Air; together with Experiments on Platina. By John Ingenhousz, M. D. F. R. S. Physician to their Imperial Majesties at Vienna. In a Letter to Sir John Pringle, Bart. P. R. S.—16. An Account of Three Journeys from the Cape Town into the Southern Parts of Africa; undertaken for the Discovery of new Plants, towards the Improvement of the Royal Botanical Gardens at Kew. By Mr. Francis Masson, one of his Majesty's Gardeners. Addressed to Sir John Pringle, Bart. P. R. S.—17. Meteorological Journal, kept at the House of the Royal Society, by Order of the President and Council."

The seventh of the above articles, containing an account of the Romanish language; of which some of our readers probably never heard the name before \*, is curious.

"The Bible lately presented to the Royal Society by the Count De Salis, being a version into a language as little attended to in this country, as it may appear curious to those who take pleasure in philosophical inquiries; I embrace this opportunity to communicate to you, and, with your approbation, to the society, all that I have been able to collect concerning its history and present state.

"This

\* This language, however, we are told was almost universally understood in this kingdom under Edward the Confessor; being not only used at court, but frequently at the bar, and even sometimes in the pulpit.

" This language is called *Romanſh*, and is now ſpoken in the moſt mountainous parts of the country of the Grifons, near the ſources of the Rhine and the En. It conſiſts of two main dialects; which, though partaking both of the above general name, differ, however, ſo widely as to conſtitute in a manner two diſtinct languages. Books are printed in both of them; and each, though it be univerſally underſtood in its reſpective diſtrict, is yet ſub-divided into almoſt as many ſecondary dialects as there are villages in which it is ſpoken; which differ, however, but little, except in the pronunciation. One of the main dialects, which is ſpoken in the Engadine, a valley extending from the ſource of the En to the frontiers of the Tyroleſe, is by the inhabitants called *Ladin*. It admits of ſome variation, even in the books, according as they are printed either in the upper or the lower part of this province. The abovementioned bible is in the dialect of the lower Engadine; which, however, is perfectly underſtood in the upper part of that province, where they uſe no other verſion. The other dialect, which is the language of the Grey, or Upper League, is diſtinguiſhed from the former by the name of *Cialover*: and I muſt here obſerve, that in the very center, and moſt inacceſſible parts of this latter diſtrict, there are ſome villages ſituated in narrow vallies, called Rheinwald, Cepina,\* &c. in which a third language is ſpoken, more ſimilar to the German than to either of the above idioms, although they be neither contiguous, nor have any great intercourſe with the parts where the German is uſed."

Mr. Planta, after recapitulating the principal events, which may have affected the language of the Grifons, proceeds to obſerve that,

" Although the name of *Romanſh*, which the whole language bears, ſeem to be a badge of Roman ſervitude, yet the conqueſt of that nation, if ever effected, could not have produced a great alteration in a language which muſt already have been ſo ſimilar to their own; and its general name may as well be attributed to the pacific as to the hoſtile Romans. But when we conſider that a coalition of the two main dialects, which differ ſo far as not to be reciprocally underſtood, muſt have been the inevitable conſequence of a total reduction; and that ſuch a coalition is known never to have taken place, we may lay the greater ſtreſs upon the many paſſages of ancient authors,† in which it is implied that the boaiſted victories of the Romans over the Rhæti, for which public honours had been decreed to L. Munatus, M. Anthony, Drufus, and Auguſtus, amounted to no more than frequent repulſes of thoſe hardy people into

I 2

their

\* Tſchudi Rhæt. Deſcript. p. 43. Merian Topogr. Helvet. p. 64.

† Videre Rhæti bella ſub Alpibus

Drufum gerentem et Vindelici.

----- immanefque Rhætos

Auſpiciis repulſi ſecundis.

Fundat ab extremo flavos aquilone Suevos

Albis, et indomitum Rhæni Caput.

----- Rhenumque minacem

Cornibus infractis.

Hor. lib. 4. ode iv.

lib. ode xiv.

Luc. lib. ii. 52.

CLAUD. Laud. Stilich. lib. 1. 320.

their mountains; out of which their want of sufficient room and sustenance, (which in our days drives considerable numbers of them into the services of foreign powers) compelled them at times to make desperate excursions in quest of necessaries. And we may also from these collected authorities be induced to give the greater credit to the commentator of Lucan,\* and to the modern historians,† who positively assert, that the people living near the sources of the Rhine and the En were never totally subdued by the Roman arms; but only repelled in their attempts to harass their neighbours.

“ This whole country, however, from its central situation, could not but be annumerated to one of the provinces of the empire; and accordingly we find that Rhætia itself (which by the accounts of ancient geographers ‡ appears to have extended its limits beyond the lake of Constance, Augsburg, and Trent, towards Germany, and to Como and Verona towards Italy) was formed into a Roman province, governed by a pro-consul or procurator, who resided at Augsburg; and that when in the year 119, the Emperor Adrian divided it into Rhætia *prima* and *secunda*, the governor of the former, in which the country I am now speaking of must have been comprized, took up his residence in two castles situated where Coire now stands, whilst the other continued his seat at Augsburg. But notwithstanding these appearances, no trace or monument of Roman servitude is to be met with in this district, except the ambiguous name of one mountain,§ situated on the skirts of these highlands, and generally thought to have been the *non plus ultra* of the Roman arms on the Italian side.

“ From the difficulty those persevering veterans experienced in keeping this stubborn people in awe, I mean to infer that such strenuous assertors of their independence, whom the flattering pens of Ovid and Horace represent as formidable even to Augustus, and preferring death to the loss of their liberties,|| favoured by the natural strength and indigence of their country, were not very likely to be so far subdued by any foreign power inferior to the Roman, as to suffer any considerable revolution in their customs and language: for as to the irruptions of the Goths, Vandals, and Lombards, in the fifth and sixth centuries, besides a profound silence in history concerning any successful attempt of those barbarians upon this spot, it is scarce credible, that any of them should have either wished or endeavoured to settle in a country, perhaps far less hospitable than that they had just forsaken, especially after they had opened to themselves a way into the fertile plains of Lombardy.

“ There are incontestable proofs (says Mr. Planta) that this language was once universal all over France: and that this, and not immediately the Latin, hath been the parent of the Provençal, and  
after-

\* Horten in Lucan. p. 163. edit. 1578. fol.

† Sprech, p. 18, &c.

‡ Strabo, lib. iv. sub. fin. Cluver, Ital. vet. lib. i. c. 16.

§ Julius Mons, Scheuchzer Iter. Alp. p. 114.

|| Rhætica nunc præbent Thracique arma metum.

Ovid. Trist. lib. ii. 226.

Devota morti pectora libera,

Hor. 4 lib. ode xiv.



afterwards of the modern French, the Italian, and the Spanish. The oath taken by Lewis the Germanic, in the year 842, in confirmation of an alliance between him and Charles the Bald, his brother, is a decisive proof of the general use of the Romance by the whole French nation at that time, and of their little knowledge of the Teutonic, which being the native tongue of Lewis, would certainly have been used by him in this oath, had it been understood by the French to whom he addressed himself. But Nithardus,\* a cotemporary writer and near relation to the contracting parties, informs us, that Lewis took the oath in the Romance Language, in order that it might be understood by the French nobility who were the subjects of Charles; and that they, in their turn, entered into reciprocal engagements in *their own language*, which the same author again declares to have been the Romance, and not the Teutonic; although one would imagine that, had they at all understood this latter tongue, they could not but have used it upon this occasion, in return for the condescension of Lewis.

“As a comparison between this language and the Romanish of the Grisons cannot be considered as a mere object of curiosity; but may also serve to corroborate the proofs I have above alledged of the antiquity of the latter, I have annexed in the appendix, a translation of this oath into the language of Engadine, which approaches nearest to it; although I must observe, that there are in the other dialect some words which have a still greater affinity with the language of the oath, as appears by another translation I have procured, in which both dialects are indifferently used. To prevent any doubts concerning the veracity of these translations, I must here declare, that I am indebted for them, and for several anecdotes concerning that language, to a man of letters, who is a native and hath long been an inhabitant of the Grisons, and is lately come to reside in London. I have added to this comparative view of those two languages the Latin words from which both seem to have been derived; and, as a proof of the existence of the Gallic Romance in France down to the twelfth century, I have also subjoined the words used in that kingdom at that period, as they are given us by the author of the article (*Langue*) *Romane*, in the French Encyclopedie.”

The curious reader will not be displeased at our citing this oath of Lewis; which Duclos, in his history of the Gallic Romance, gives as the first monument of that language.

#### Oath of Lewis the Germanic.

1. Latin from which the Romances are derived.
2. Gallic Romance in which the oath was taken.
3. French of the twelfth century.
4. Romanish of Engadine, called Ladin.
5. Romanish of both dialects.

1. Pro Dei amore, et pro Christiano populo, et nostro
2. Pro Deu amur, et pro Christian poblo, et nostro
3. Por Deu amor, et por Christian pople, & nostre
4. Per amur da Dieu, et per il Christian poewel, et nost
5. Pro l'amur da Deus, et pro il Christian pobel, et nost

1. com-

\* Du Chesne, Hist. Franc. tom. ii. p. 374.

1. *commun* salvamento, de ista die in abante, in quan-
2. *commun* salvament, d'ist di en avant, in quant
3. *commun* salvament, de sie di en avant, en quant
4. *commun* salvament, da quist di in avant, in quant
5. *commun* salvament, d'ist di en avant, in quant
1. *tum* Deus sapere et posse mihi donat, sic salvabo ego
2. *Deus* savoir et podir me dunat, si salvarai io
3. *Deu* saveir et poir me donne, si salvarai je
4. *Dieu* savoir et podair m'duna, shi salvaro ei
5. *Deus* savoir et podir m'dunat, shi salvaro io
1. *eccistum* meum fratrem KARLUM, et in adjutum ero
2. *cist* meon fradre KARLO, et in adjudab er
3. *cist* mon frere KARLE, et en adjude serai
4. *quist* mieu frær CARLO, et in adjud li faro
5. *quist* meu frad'r CARL, et in adjudh faro
1. in quaque una causa, sic quomodo homo per directum
2. in cadbuna cosa, si cum om per dreit
3. en cescune cose, si cum om per dreict
4. in chiaduna chioffa, shi sebo l'hom per drett
5. in caduna cosa, si com om per drett
1. suum fratrem salvare debet, in hoc quod ille mihi
2. son fradre salvar dist, in o quid il me
3. son frere salvar dist, en o qui il me
4. sieu frær salvar d'uefs, in que chél a mi
5. seu frad'r salvar des, in que chél me
1. alterum sic faceret; et ab Lothario nullum placitum
2. altresí fazet; et ab Ludber nul plaid
3. altresí faset; et a Lothaire nul plaid
4. altresí fadschefs; et da Lothar mai non prendrò io un
5. altresí fazefs; et da Lothar nul plaid mai
1. nunquam prehendam quod meo volle eccisti meo fratri
2. nunquam prindrai qui meon vol cist meon fradre
3. nonques prendrai qui par mon voil a cist mon frere
4. pléd che con mieu volair a quist mieu frær
5. non prendrò che con meu voler a quist meu frad'r
1. KARLO in damno sit.
2. KARLE in damno sit.
3. KARLE en dam seït.
4. CARLO sai in damn.
5. CARL in damn fia.

On this language Mr Planta farther observes,

“ That the language of the Romans penetrated very early into Spain, appears most evidently from a passage in Strabo,\* who asserts, that the Turditani inhabiting the banks of the Boetis, now the Guadalquivir, forgot their original tongue, and adopted that of the conquerors. That the Romance was used there in the fourteenth century appears from a correspondence between St. Vincent of Ferrieres

and

\* Lib. III.

and Don Martin, son of Peter the IVth of Arragon :\* and that this language must once have been common in that kingdom appears manifestly from the present name of the Spanish, which is still usually called Romance.† These circumstances considered, I am not so much inclined to discredit a fact related by Mabillon,‡ who says, that in the eighth century a paralytic Spaniard, on paying his devotions at the tomb of a saint in the church of Fulda, conversed with a monk of that abbey, who, *because he was an Italian*, understood the language of the Spaniard. Neither does an oral tradition I heard some time ago appear now so absurd to me, as it did when it was first related to me, which says, that two Catalonians travelling over the Alps, were not a little surprized when they came into the Grisons, to find that their native tongue was understood by the inhabitants, and that they could comprehend most of the language of that country.

“ The universality of the Romance in the French dominions during the eleventh century, also accounts for its introduction in Palestine and many other parts of the Levant by Godfrey de Bouillon, and the multitude of adventurers who engaged under him in the Crusade. The assizes or laws of Jerusalem, and those of Cyprus, are standing monuments of the footing that language had obtained in those parts ; and if we may trust a Spanish historian of some reputation § who resided in Greece in the thirteenth century, the Athenians and the inhabitants of Morea spoke at that time the same language that was used in France. And there is great reason to imagine, that the affinity the *Lingua Franca* bears to the French and Italian is entirely to be derived from the Romance, which was once commonly used in the ports of the Levant. The heroic achievements and gallantry of the Knights of the Cross also gave rise to the swarm of fabulous narratives ; which, though not an invention of those days, were yet, from the name of the language in which they were written, ever after distinguished by the appellation of *Romances*.”||

[To be continued.]

\* Mabill. an. I. 64. n. 124.

† Orozco, Tes. Castell. voce Romance---Conf. crecumb. Volg. Poet. I. v. c. i.

‡ Aët. Ben. Sæc. 3. p. 2. p. 258.

§ Kaym. Montanero Chronica de Juan I.

|| Huet, Orig. des Rom. p. 126. ed. 1678.

*Travels through France and Spain, in the years 1770 and 1771.*

*In which is particularly minutely, the present State of those Countries, respecting the Agriculture, Population, Manufactures, Commerce, the Arts and useful Undertakings. By Joseph Marshall, Esq; Vol. IV. 8vo. 6s. Corral.*

The favourable reception, which the preceeding volumes of this writer's travels hath met with, hath very naturally excited the public curiosity respecting the person of the author. Our enquiries, however, have been hitherto fruitless, so that we cannot

not take upon us to decide whether the contents of this work are really the genuine experience of the writer, or whether he is not indebted to the experience of others for the various information, with which his publication abounds.

We cannot help thinking we discover in many places the traces of translation; but, be this as it may, the whole bears the internal marks of having been deduced from sufficient authority to recommend it to the reader's attention.

The present Volume is divided into nine Chapters. In the first, our traveller tells us, he entered Lorain, on the 10th of October 1770. at Sar Louis, in his way to Metz, taking the road to Boulay: of the country between which and Ury he gives the following account, in respect to its husbandry, produce, &c.

"From Boulay to Ury, the country is very agreeable; the river Nid branches through a rich, but not well cultivated, tract. Ury is well situated, on a fine plain, with a ridge of mountains to the north, and at a small distance a forest to the south. My design was to reach Metz by night; but, upon enquiry after my favourite subject, the landlord of the Golden Lion, a very indifferent inn at Ury, informed me, that he was himself ignorant of agriculture, but could recommend a farmer that could give my Honour all the information I could desire: this intelligence determined me to sleep at his inn, bad as it was. The peasant was sent for, and being arrived, he gave me the following account of the husbandry of the neighbourhood of this town:

"The soil upon the rivers is a moist good loam; at a distance from them it is stony, yet not unfertile;—the stones rather assist than prevent vegetation, which I still think very surprising. Where-ever it is cultivated, the fields are open. I explained the advantages, as well as I could, of the English system of inclosing: but my friend the Lorainer did not agree with me. 'If,' said he, 'our fields were all, as you say, inclosed, they would many of them be so wet, that our tillage would be interrupted. At present the sun and wind have a free course over all our lands, and consequently dry them very soon. I have,' added he, 'three lands under the forest; they are the worst upon my farm, because the wettest: this is owing totally to the neighbourhood of wood; but if all my fields were inclosed, as you say, with hedges, my whole farm would be as bad, and I should be ruined.' I then explained counter advantages, and the use of draining; but made no impression: he persisted that open fields were much more advantageous to him than inclosures would be; and insisted, that no arrangement of his lands would yield him better than his old one, of 1. Fallow. 2. Wheat. 3. Barley.

"Their products of wheat are, from one and an half to two and an half. What manure they raise is all laid on for this crop; and the very best management will not carry this product to more than three quarters. The farms are, in general, rented by tenants, some of whom pay their landlords in kind; a circumstance I little expected to find an instance of so soon in France: the more general method, however,

however, is, that of a pecuniary rept. As to leases, they have none, being all tenants at will. The vineyards are chiefly in the hands of the gentlemen, who mostly live at Metz, and the people who cultivate them are in the worst circumstances of any in the country; the wine is but a poor vin-du pays, which answers nothing but their limited home-consumption: the nett profit does not exceed 3l. 10s. an acre. The nett produce of wheat is reckoned 1l. 8s. per acre, or 14s. per annum: that of barley 9s. of oats 7s. 6d. and of pease about as much as barley. There are a few turneps, but miserably cultivated; and some clover, but it is not sown till the land is so exhausted, that the farmer does not think it worth the expence of a fallow; consequently the soil yields as much weeds as clover. From these circumstances the reader will perceive, that the agriculture here is in general very bad: taxes are very irregular. Though Lorain is exempted from the great curse of the French husbandry, the arbitrary taille, yet is the provincial subsidy levied in a manner not much superior to that tax. Every district receives the requisition of the sum which is to be paid by way of land-tax, and, instead of the intendant, their own magistrates assess the proportions; but for want of some such rule as is followed in England, the farmers are almost as much oppressed as if they were in the hands of the intendants; not to speak of the capitation, which is levied here with all the severity of the French government. These circumstances, with the want of leases, would be sufficient to keep down the industry of the people; yet is there another that oppresses them as much, which is the want of a market. The quantity of waste land is very great, yet is the price of the farmer's product very low; so that, for want of exportation, which is prohibited, they could not find a sale for larger quantities of corn than they raise."

At Metz is established a society of arts and sciences, of which is given us the following account:

"The Duke de Belleisle was the founder, in 1760; the annual revenue is about 200l. sterling: they expend this income in giving a medal of gold of the Duke, as premiums, the value about fifteen guineas. The object of their encouragement is principally agriculture; also commerce, and useful arts. They have given several medals to the improvers of waste and barren tracts of land; also for improvements in the making their wines; particularly for a press of a new invention,---also for the culture of flax and African millet. They likewise offered their medal for improvements in spinning and weaving, and likewise for the greatest crops raised of wheat on given quantities of land. One of the most remarkable instances of their success was in the case of one Pierre de Laurete, a peasant at St. Agnel, in the forest, who farms his own lands. This man improved a very poor sandy tract of land, which never had yielded any valuable produce; and his progress, in as few words as I can give it, was as follows: with the permission of the principal owners of the adjacent parishes, he inclosed it; (no great favour in so waste and neglected a part of the country); this he did, by planting a hornbeam hedge around it, having first thrown up a small parapet of the sand. This



hedge prospered very much. His next business was to manure a part of his inclosure every year, till he had gone through the whole. This he did, by digging on the spot for a stiff loamy earth, approaching to clay, which he spread in large quantities on the surface, and then ploughed and sowed it with buck wheat, getting fine crops, of from three quarters to four and a half, which nearly paid all the expences of the manuring. After the buck wheat, his method was to sow rye upon one ploughing; and of this he got two quarters an acre: then he ploughed thrice, and took a crop of barley; the product about equal to that of the rye. After the barley, he sowed turneps, which he used for feeding his cows, oxen, swine, and sheep. M. Rochè could not inform me of his culture of this root; but his success with it was reckoned very great, as it enabled him much to increase his stock of cattle. The turneps he followed with another crop of barley; and this has been the general method he has pursued throughout the improvement. The parts of it which were first manured begin to wear out, and the peasant expects they will soon want a fresh supply of manure, as before; a circumstance probably owing to his ploughing so light a soil so often for arable crops. It would have been more prudent to have sown clover, which is very well known in this country, which, staying some years on the land, would have given it the due repose; a point of more consequence to so light a soil than most others. This industrious peasant had the offer of a pecuniary reward, instead of the gold medal of the Society; but he preferred the latter, hearing it was much valued by the gentry. An instance of the love of honour in the inferior class of people, which deserves notice.

Of the political and commercial state of this province, our traveller speaks with a partiality, perhaps not altogether becoming him as an Englishman.

"I conversed, says he, with M. de Rochè upon the political economy of Lorain since the death of King Stanislaus; but not with that satisfaction I could have wished; there was so much of the Frenchman in his accounts, that what he said required good allowance. I had formerly, on other occasions, found the propensity to exaggeration, amazingly greater in France than in any other country; which made me cautious on my entering the country a second time. He assured me, that Lorain, in general, was in the most flourishing situation imaginable; that the taxes were light, and administered with the most perfect equity; a circumstance which I knew from other information to be absolutely false; and I had before received accounts, that the people were discontented. The case is, they are, in this country, except on the Moselle, in great want of commerce: that river being navigable, to Toul Nancy, and some other considerable places, and communicating with the Rhine, gives some trade to Metz, which animates the industry of that place, and its neighbourhood; but when you get out of reach of the river, there is a visible deadness, an evident want of a quick market.

"At Metz there are carried on some brisk manufactures of rattines, serges, and druggets: of these I made several enquiries, and found, that, since the peace of 1762, they had been much revived, but had

not yet near recovered the prosperity they lost by the war. The account they gave me of the destruction the ill success of their country in the quarrel with England, brought on the manufactures of all this territory, I can easily believe, as I am clear the truth much exceeded any thing they would own. They assured me that the weight of taxes was very great, and felt more than to the natural amount, by coming at a time when their market was every day destroying both abroad and at home. Their rattines they make principally for the home-consumption, many also of their serges, but their druggets were in general for exportation. The national poverty which arose from the war, destroyed much of their own consumption; for every man was soon forced to retrench every part of his expence, which fell heavy on all the manufacturers of the kingdom; and within three years from the breaking out of the war, their great exportation was reduced to a very trifle, sent by the Rhine to Rotterdam. In this situation they were unable to pay their workmen, who, finding no employment, either starved with their families, enlisted in the army, or fled into Switzerland and the South of Germany, from whence none ever returned. In this manner great numbers were cut off; and from the best accounts I could gain, this part of France lost more men in this manner than it did by the war; and yet the drafts from the militia in all the frontier provinces were greater than from the distant ones, on account of their vicinity, and ease of transports on the rivers to their army in Germany. The Frenchmen I conversed with on this point owned much more than they otherwise would; because they had no occasion to lay the fault on the King: his mistress bore the whole blame; but La Pompadour was the object of execration; forgetting, that nothing could be laid to the fault of one without bearing ten times heavier on the other. Upon the conclusion of the peace, a general joy spread through the manufacturers of this country, and especially Metz, yet were not their miseries healed; so many master-manufacturers were dead, removed, or gone into other ways of maintaining themselves, that no vigour was to be seen in the new undertakings for a long time. The few that had stood all the shocks of the war, and had kept together a few workmen, were able to increase them gradually: but for want of capital could do this but slowly. This arose not only from their own want of money, but that of all their customers; for, tho' the treaty of Paris ended the war, it did not end the accumulation of taxes occasioned by the war. The Government found it necessary to continue these; and the poverty of the people continued with them. Now, a people kept so poor by taxes, must be very bad customers to the manufacturers: nor did foreign trade revive so soon as they expected; for some of it was absolutely destroyed, and some of it got into other channels. From all which circumstances I could easily believe one piece of information they gave me, that they have not at present half so good a trade as they had in the year 1756, nor make half so many goods; and yet they have been almost regularly rising ever since: but they are strongly impressed with the notion, and I believe it is a just one, that they never will regain the ground they lost by the last war. A circumstance, which, as an Englishman, I have

reason to wish may be the case throughout all France, as I believe it is."

Speaking of the cheapness of living in this province, particularly at Lunneville, where the late Stanislaus kept his court, our traveller makes the following reflections on the populousness of places, where provisions and the means of subsistence are the dearest.

"The cheapness of living in some parts of France cannot well be thought of, without some reflections arising on the comparison with England, which is so much dearer; yet it is a certain fact, that more foreigners resort to England than to France. Is not this surprising? It cannot be the liberty of England that attracts low people; they are no judges of it. Great numbers of Frenchmen, in the lowest circumstances, go to England; most certainly not on account of the government: they do not philosophize enough for that, I can attribute it to nothing but national wealth. Men will fly to countries where money is plentiful, almost as naturally as the needle to the north. It matters not telling them that every thing is so dear in rich countries, that 6d. a day at their homes, is as much as 1s. abroad. It is not that they cannot, but they will not, comprehend this: they think that where there is so much money stirring, some of it must come to their share; whereas, by staying at home, they are sure of getting nothing but their old pay. And this, I think, is a strong reason against those who urge the danger of England losing her manufacturers from the high prices of the necessities of life. If they emigrate, it must be from 1s. to 8d. a day, which is such an obvious change, that no other consideration will make it up to them. But there is another circumstance attending cheapness, which deserves to be considered; where it arises, as it generally does, from the lowness of national wealth, the employment of the poor must be more uncertain and hazardous, and they must experience a total want of it oftner than where money is plentiful. This is certainly the case in France, where, in no manufactures, nor in agriculture, are they employed with regularity; whereas, in England they do not experience this variation near so much. And it is to this I attribute the amazing number of beggars to be met with in every part of France. I have heard gentlemen in England complain of their beggars: were they only to land at Calais or Bologne for one half hour, they would change their ideas. Nor can you go into the most unfrequented parts of the kingdom, without finding it the same. It is melancholy to see so many beggars in the midst of the fertile plains of Lunneville and Nancy; and yet more melancholy, to reflect on the great tracts of waste forest-land in Lorain, especially in the southern parts, which, cultivated, would maintain so many more people.

"The want of improvement is as much owing to the want of wealth, as to the government; but it must be allowed, that their poverty is partly owing to the ill administration of government. In all absolute monarchies, there must be great inequality among mankind: the nobility will be immensely rich, and the lower classes in poverty: and as the great spend their wealth in the court and the capital, and scarce ever see their estates, the money that is  
in

in the nation gets into a wrong channel : manufactures of luxury receive great encouragement, and the inferior ones, of utility and agriculture, are neglected. Thus, in the midst of wealth, these may be poor, which in England cannot be the case, from the great diffusion of wealth.

The above reflections, of our traveller, respecting the multiplicity of beggars in France, seem to contradict the general well-grounded observation, " that beggars abound in rich countries, while in those that are poor, few if any are to be found." And certain it is, where the bulk of the inhabitants are poor, there will in general be few native beggars. Mendicants will naturally emigrate from places where the inhabitants have nothing to give away. In such public roads as those which pass through Calais and Bologne, it is no wonder that beggars abound ; but if their abundance on the fertile plains of Lunneville and Nancy be not accidental and temporary, owing, as the writer says, to the uncertain and hazardous employment of the poor, it is probably a proof that the country is in a more flourishing state than is here described.

*(To be concluded in our next.)*

*An Account of the Life of George Berkeley, D. D. late of Cloyne, in Ireland. With Notes containing Strictures upon his Works. 8vo. 2s. Murray.*

" There seems to be an odd fatality, says the author of this account, attending upon some of the first characters in the republic of letters, that the very celebrity they had deservedly acquired amongst their cotemporaries has prevented an accurate knowledge of their lives from descending to posterity.

" A writer, distinguished by uncommon abilities, more especially if that writer has acted a busy part on the stage of life, is so frequently the subject of conversation, that for some years after his removal the memories of those who knew him are thought to be sufficiently secure repositories of his fame ; 'till by degrees the fading materials on which his actions were written moulder away, and curiosity begins precisely at the point of time when the means of gratifying it are lost. How nearly this hath been the case of the excellent prelate whose life, character, and writings we have here attempted to describe, the reader will be able to form a judgment, when he is assured that in more than twenty years which have elapsed since the death of Bishop Berkeley, no account of him hath yet been offered to the public that was not either void of truth, or extremely inaccurate and defective. Neither is this intended as a censure upon such as wrote from what information they could collect, and probably thought any account, however imperfect, of so extraordinary a person, better than none : it is only offered as an excuse for the present undertaking, to which the author is conscious he brings no other qualification than knowledge of the truth of every fact he relates, and an entire freedom from prejudice

prejudice. Particular acquaintance with the family and friends of Bishop Berkeley has put him in possession of the first; the course itself of the following narrative will best shew, whether he has any just pretensions to the latter."

It might have given additional satisfaction to his readers, had this writer favoured the public with his name; from which information they might probably have been able to form some judgment of what weight his personal acquaintance with the family and friends of the good Bishop, and his entire freedom from prejudice ought to have with the public. There is perhaps no stronger mark of prepossession in the world, than that of a man's presuming to be divested of all prejudice; as it argues the strongest and most rooted prejudice in favour of himself. Hence the modesty with which our biographer speaks of his abilities for the task he has undertaken, will naturally appear affected; although, if it be real, it is certainly well founded: this account being a meagre production, of which the historical facts are already very generally known; nor do the notes that are subjoined afford any striking proof of the writer's profundity in philosophical, or acuteness in logical, investigation. As a specimen of both parts, we shall extract a few passages from each.

"In February, 1713, he [Mr. Berkeley] crossed the water, and published in London a further defence of his celebrated system of immaterialism, in *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*. Acuteness of parts, and a beautiful imagination were so conspicuous in his writings, that his reputation was now established, and his company was courted, even where his opinions did not find admission. Two gentlemen of opposite principles concurred in introducing him to the acquaintance of the learned and great Sir Richard Steele, and Dr. Swift\*. He wrote several papers in the Guardian for the former, and at his house became acquainted with Mr. Pope, with whom he continued to live in strict friendship during his life. Dean Swift, besides Lord Berkeley of Stratton, (to whom our author dedicated his last published dialogues between Hylas and Philonous) and other valuable acquaintance, recommended him to the celebrated Earl of Peterborough, who being appointed ambassador to the King of Sicily and to the other Italian states, took Mr. Berkeley with him in quality of chaplain and secretary, in November 1713.

"At Leghorn, his lordship's well known activity induced him to disencumber himself of his chaplain and the greatest part of his retinue, whom he left in that town for upwards of three months, while he discharged the business of his embassy in Sicily, as our author informs his friend Pope in the conclusion of a complimentary letter† addressed to that poet on the Rape of the Lock, dated Leghorn, May 1, 1714. It may not be amiss to record a little incident that  
befel

\* That is, Sir R. S. and Dr. Swift were the two gentlemen who introduced him to the acquaintance with the learned and the great. Not that they were the learned and great to whom he was introduced, as is here said. REV.

† Pope's Works.



besel Mr. Berkeley in this city, with the relation of which he used sometimes to make himself merry among his friends. Basil Kennett, the author of the *Roman Antiquities*, then chaplain to the English factory at Leghorn, the only place in Italy where the English service is tolerated by the government, which favour had lately been obtained from the Grand Duke at the particular instance of Queen Anne. This gentleman requested Mr. Berkeley to preach for him one Sunday. The day following, as Berkeley was sitting in his chamber, a procession of priests in surplices, and with all other formalities, entered the room, and without taking the least notice of the wondering inhabitant, marched quite round it, muttering certain prayers. His fears immediately suggested to him that this could be no other than a visit from the inquisition, who had heard of his officiating before heretics without licence the day before. As soon as they were gone, he ventured with much caution to enquire into the cause of this extraordinary appearance, and was happy to be informed, that this was the season appointed by the Romish calendar for solemnly blessing the houses of all good catholics from rats and other vermin; a piece of intelligence which changed his terror into mirth.

“He returned to England with Lord Peterborough in August, 1714, and his hopes of preferment through this channel expiring with the fall of Queen Anne’s ministry, he sometime after embraced an advantageous offer made him by Dr. St. George Ashe, Bishop of Clogher, and late Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, of accompanying his son, Mr. Ashe, (who was heir to a very considerable property) in a tour through Europe.

“At Paris, having now more leisure than when he first passed through that city, Mr. Berkeley took care to pay his respects to his rival in metaphysical sagacity, the illustrious Pere Malebranche. He found this ingenious father in his cell, cooking in a small pipkin a medicine for a disorder with which he was then troubled, an inflammation on the lungs. The conversation naturally turned on our author’s system, of which the other had received some knowledge from a translation just published. But the issue of this debate proved tragical to poor Malebranche.—In the heat of disputation he raised his voice so high, and gave way so freely to the natural impetuosity of a man of parts and a Frenchman, that he brought on himself a violent increase of his disorder, which carried him off a few days after\*.

In the year 1721, we are told Mr Berkeley took the degrees of Batchelor and Doctor of Divinity: and in “the year following his fortune received a considerable increase from a very unexpected event. On his first going to London in the year 1713, Dean Swift introduced him to the family of Mrs. Esther Vanhomrigh, a lady whose name is no stranger to these memoirs, and took him often to dine at her house. Some years before her death, Vanessa † had removed to Ireland, and  
fixed

\* He died October 13, 1715. Dict. hist. portatif d’Advocat.

† That is, Mrs. Vanhomrigh, whose name this writer says is no stranger to these memoirs,—an expression of which we do not rightly conceive the construction. Rev.

fixed her residence at Cell-bridge, a pleasant village in the neighbourhood of Dublin, most probably with a view of often enjoying the company of a man, for whom she seems to have entertained a very singular attachment. But finding herself totally disappointed in this expectation, and discovering the Dean's connection with Stella, she was so enraged at his infidelity, that she altered her intention of making him her heir, and left the whole of her fortune, amounting to near 8000*l.* to be divided equally between two gentlemen whom she named her executors, Mr. Marshall, a lawyer, afterwards Mr. Justice Marshall, and Dr. Berkeley, S. F. T. C. D. The doctor received the news of this bequest from Mr. Marshall with great surprise, as he had never once seen the lady who had honoured him with such a proof of her esteem, from the time of his return to Ireland to her death. It was fortunate however for Swift, that Berkeley was chosen one of her executors: for, in consequence of this trust, the whole correspondence between Cadenus and Vanessa, as well as the poem that goes under that name, fell into the hands of a man who had so much tenderness for his friend's reputation as to burn the letters immediately, though he saw nothing in the verses that should hinder their publication. From some fragments that have since got into print (probably hasty extracts taken by such as had seen them before they came into Dr. Berkeley's hands) it appears, that if there was nothing criminal, there was at least a warmth in those letters, that justifies Dr. Berkeley's delicacy in suppressing them. Mr. Marshall, the other executor, had entered so far into the resentment of his benefactress against Swift, and was besides so attached to that Bettsworth whom the Dean's satiric muse has immortalized, that he was not without difficulty prevailed upon to give his consent to their suppression."

Of the failure of Dr. Berkeley's famous scheme of instituting a college at the Bermudas or Summer-Islands, our biographer gives the following account:

"He directed his course to Rhode Island, which lay nearest to Bermuda, with a view of purchasing lands on the adjoining continent as estates for the support of his college; having a promise from those in power, that the parliamentary grant should be paid him as soon as ever such lands should be pitched upon and agreed for.

"But, continues our author, when estates had been agreed for, it was fully expected that the public money would, according to grant, be immediately paid as the purchase of them. But the minister had never heartily embraced the project, and parliamentary influence had by this time interposed, in order to divert the grant into another channel. The sale of the lands in St. Christopher's, it was found, would produce 90,000*l.* Of this sum 80,000*l.*\* was destined to pay the marriage portion of the Princess Royal, on her nuptials with the Prince of Orange: the remainder General Oglethorpe † had interest enough in parliament to obtain, for the purpose of carrying over and settling foreign and other Protestants in his new colony of Georgia in much

\* Commons Journal, May 10, 1733.

† Ibid.

America. The project indeed of the trustees for establishing this colony appears to have been equally humane and disinterested: but it is much to be lamented that it should interfere with another of more extensive and lasting utility, which, if it had taken effect by the education of the youth of New England and other colonies, we may venture with great appearance of reason to affirm, would have planted such principles of religion and loyalty among them, as might have gone a good way towards preventing the present unhappy troubles in that part of the world. But to proceed:

“After having received various excuses, Bishop Gibson, at that time bishop of London (in whose diocese all the West Indies are included) applying to Sir Robert Walpole, then at the head of the treasury, was favoured at length with the following very honest answer: ‘If you put this question to me,’ says Sir Robert, ‘as a Minister, I must and can assure you that the money shall most undoubtedly be paid as soon as suits with public convenience: but if you ask me as a friend, whether Dean Berkeley should continue in America, expecting the payment of 10,000*l*. I advise him by all means to return home to Europe, and to give up his present expectations.’ The Dean being informed of this conference by his good friend the Bishop, and thereby fully convinced that the bad policy of one great man had rendered abortive a scheme, whereon he had expended much of his private fortune, and more than seven years of the prime of his life, returned to Europe. Before he left Rhode Island, he distributed what books he had brought with him among the clergy of that province; and immediately after his arrival in London, he returned all the private subscriptions that had been advanced for the support of his undertaking.”

From our biographer's strictures on the Bishop's writings, we shall select what he says on his most celebrated performance, entitled, “*The Principles of human Knowledge*.”

“The object of the *Principles of human Knowledge*, as well as of the *Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, is to prove, that the commonly received notion of the existence of matter is false, and inconsistent with itself; that those things which are called sensible material objects are not external to the mind, but exist in it, and are nothing more than impressions made upon our minds by the immediate act of God, according to certain rules, termed laws of nature, from which in the ordinary course of his government he never deviates; that the steady adherence of the supreme Spirit to these rules is what constitutes the reality of things to his creatures, and so effectually distinguishes the ideas perceived by sense from such as are the work of the mind itself or of dreams, that there is no more danger of confounding them together on this hypothesis than on the common supposition of matter. The not attending to this distinction, which however is inculcated over and over by our author, has led many to suppose that Berkeley was an arrant sceptic that rejected the testimony of his senses; when in truth the dispute is not about the reality of our sensations (and so far only the testimony of mere sense extends)—for of this he was as firmly convinced as any body could be,

be, and of the necessity of acting accordingly—but concerning the *causes* of those sensations, whether they proceed from a set of insensible material beings without us, or immediately from the Creator himself. His principal argument against the existence of those material beings may be reduced to this syllogism :

Whatever is immediately perceived by sense, is an idea.

Sensible things are things immediately perceived by sense.

Therefore sensible things are ideas ; and consequently exist only in the mind.

For the proof of the second proposition he appeals to the feelings of his reader, and asks, whether by what he calls sensible things he means any thing else but the things he immediately perceives by sense ? whether, for instance, when he says this table exists, he means any thing more than that he sees and feels it, that is, perceives it by his senses ? If you answer, that you are indeed immediately conscious only of the sensation, but that reason obliges you to infer from thence the existence of an external being which is the cause of it, he joins issue with you and says, the question then is only whether this external cause is active or inactive, spirit or matter. Now it is a contradiction to suppose that unthinking matter can be the cause of ideas : for causality supposes action : action must consist either in motion or volition : it cannot consist in the former, because motion is a sensible quality, i. e. an idea ; but all our ideas are passive, inert, including nothing of action in them : therefore nothing can be active, and consequently nothing can be a *cause* without volition. See Hylas, page 265, London 1734.—But, not to mention that a thing is here asserted which no force of argument will ever make out, that a quality of body is the same thing with an idea in the mind, it is obvious to observe, that the whole is merely an argument *ab ignorantia*, grounded on our inability of shewing the manner by which body operates on spirit ; an inability, however, which cannot take away that of whose existence we have otherwise good reason to be satisfied. This good reason then appears to us to be simply the very same that Dr. Reid first pointed out, the constitution of our nature (we should call it *instinct*, if such an outcry had not lately been raised against that word) which antecedent to, and independent of all reasoning about the matter, compels us to believe the existence of a number of beings without us both animate and inanimate, with as strong and invincible a faith as we believe the existence of ourselves and our own sensations."

We do not conceive our scholiast hath here given us the clearest state of Dr. Berkeley's system. His embracing the notion of Dr. Reid, about an intuitive common-sense, (that compels us to believe any thing antecedent to, and independent of all reasoning about the matter) proves him to be not very deep in matters of philosophy.

Our readers will probably not be displeased with our giving here a state of this question about the existence of the material world,

world, in the words of our Editor, Dr. K. on treating this subject on a particular occasion.

“ The answer to this question, ‘ what is meant by *existing* in NATURE ? ’ will clear up a number of obscurities which tend at present to cloud the face of natural philosophy.

“ Ontology is generally conceived to be an abstract science, above the sphere of physical investigation. But, if Lord Bacon was right, as he undoubtedly was, when he maintained *Physicks* to be the basis of all other sciences, even Ontology itself, so far as it is truly a science, must be physical. For, if we know that things exist only by our senses, the evidence of those senses must be the criterion by which we judge of their essence : so that it is impossible, in the very nature of things, that we should ever know any thing of their properties abstracted from the effects they have on our senses.

“ When we speak, therefore, of the properties of things, we only speak of the properties they have of causing certain particular impressions on the organs of sense. We can philosophically mean nothing else. Now the existence of any thing being known by its perceptible properties, and the thing itself consisting only of those properties by which its existence is known and its essence defined, it is evident that the things which are generally supposed to exist in nature, are in fact nothing more than natural appearances. It is the phenomena of the material universe, and not that universe itself, which is the object of physical enquiry.

“ It seems to have been this reflection, which led that acute and very singular philosopher, the Bishop of Cloyne, to deny the existence of any such thing as a material universe. But, tho’ he supported his hypothesis with an infinite deal of ingenuity, and might certainly have demolished the whole system of impenetrable matter, and its imaginary independent properties ; yet, by falling into as great an error about *thinking* SPIRIT, as the Newtonians had done about *unthinking* BODY, he lost the advantage he had gained in the contest, and left the nature of physical existence as doubtful as he found it.

“ Our knowledge of external objects depends on certain impressions made on the senses ; these impressions are imputed by Berkeley to a metaphysical or mental cause ; the Newtonians impute them to a physical or material one.

“ Now setting aside the terms mental and material, as evidently improper in an enquiry into the essence of body or mind itself, there must be in both cases an efficient cause of the effect produced. There must be the object perceived, as well as the organ perceiving, call them physical or metaphysical, material or mental, it matters not. The effects of the operation also of the one on the other, must be relative effects ; they cannot be the peculiar qualities of *either*, but joint properties dependent on both.

“ Experimental philosophers indeed have made a distinction without a difference, between the *primary* and the *secondary* qualities of bodies. The former, such as impenetrability, figure, and the like, they call the positive and inherent properties of the body : the latter,



as colours, sounds, odours, &c. they conceive to be adventitious and relative. But impenetrability and figure are as merely phenomena, as sounds and colours, or even heat or cold. Mr. Locke indeed seems to maintain this groundless distinction, by endeavouring to prove that our sensations do not resemble any of the qualities of body.

“ Dr. Reid also has very lately assured us, that he has carefully examined his various sensations, one by one; and compared them with matter and its qualities; and, as he floridly expresses it, cannot find one of them that confesses a resembling feature. I should be glad to know how, and by what experiments this comparison was made, and whether the doctor did not necessarily compare only one set of ideas with another.

“ The qualities of bodies being all relative to our modes of perception, it is impossible he should do any thing more.

“ Our knowledge of the material universe consists entirely of such comparison. Merely to see, to hear, to feel, taste or smell any thing, is not to *know*, or have any knowledge of that thing. It is by comparing the different modes, in which one and the same object is perceived, that we distinguish its various properties, and thereby define its essence.

“ An object that should have but a *single* property, might be perceived to exist; but, it could not be known or defined. It would excite only a single and simple idea; and objects are defined or distinguished by the different combination of the several simple ideas they are capable of exciting by the different senses: the combination of which constitute our complex ideas, or notions of different objects.

“ This being the case, how can we expect that the qualities of external objects should resemble our sensations of them; when even the different sensations arising from the same object do not resemble each other?

“ The object or sensation of sight does not at all resemble that of hearing; or those of sight and hearing the objects or sensations of smell, taste or touch. Taste and smell indeed seem to bear some similarity; which is most probably owing merely to mechanical causes. They are affected nearly by the same kind of motion. For, it is curious to observe, that our different modes of perception seem to be the necessary means of perceiving external objects at different distances; all which mechanically operating on the same sensorium, the momenta of the motion of light, sound, odour, savour, &c. seem to be nearly equal.

“ In light, a very small quantity of matter is moved with prodigious velocity; in that of sound, a much larger quantity with a less degree of velocity; in those of smell and taste a still larger quantity with a still less velocity; and in that of simple touch it is notorious that the resistance or force of the impression is proportional to the momentum, whether the body be great or little, in motion or at rest, impelling or impelled. It is farther to be remarked that, if in any of these cases either the quantity of matter immediately affecting the organ, or the velocity with which it moves; in other words, if the momentum of the moving medium be considerably increased, neither

the impression of colour, sound, odour, nor savour would ensue; but a sense of pain would arise, and the organ would be injured or destroyed.

"The quantity of light which, reflected from the flat surface of a natural body, would excite the agreeable sensation of colour, might, if reflected from an artificial hollow surface, or refracted through the focus of a burning glass, blind the eye. The sound of ringing of bells, that might excite a pleasing sensation of melody at a proper distance, might, if too near, or collected by means of an acoustic trumpet, deafen the ear. Strong scents and flavours, however pleasant and agreeable in their kind, when moderate, produce pain instead of pleasure, when excessive; destroying the palate and olfactory nerves.

"Now, the destruction of any sense or faculty, is not perceived or discerned by that sense or faculty itself. A man cannot see himself blind; hear that he is deaf; scent his loss of smell; or taste his want of palate; any more than he can comprehend, his own want of understanding.

"Some philosophers call colours, sounds, odours, flavours, the objects of sight, hearing, smell and taste. They tell us that, when we look at the sun in the firmament at noon day, it is not the *sun* we see, but the picture of it painted on the retina of the eye. But this is not true. Light is only the medium, by means of which we perceive visible objects; not the visible object itself. The rays of light may pencil an image on my retina, which in a delirium or reverie I do not see at all. On the other hand I may, in a delirium or sleep perceive the same image which is not pencilled on my retina by any external rays of light. A man may, with his eyes shut, or in the dark, have a strong sensation of light and colours; and in a place of profound silence have a ringing in his ears. Things dreamt of, often leave as striking impressions and in as lively colours on the memory, as any we see while awake. In neither of these cases however do we see or hear any thing.

"In order to see any object, it is necessary that the external rays of light should vibrate or continue to act from the distant visible object on the retina; and that the internal organs of perception should retract or vibrate back against the retina from the sensorium: otherwise the retina proves an opaque and impervious substance and nothing is really seen.

"People don't see merely because their eyes are open, altho' they do not see when their eyes are shut.

"The case is exactly similar with all the other senses.

"On these and many other considerations, it is absurd to suppose that things exist in nature as they do in our conception: though, at the same time, it would be equally absurd to think they could exist in our conception at all, unless their external and immediately-efficient causes had an existence in nature.

"When Bishop Berkeley therefore affirmed that the tables, chairs and other furniture in his room, did not exist in nature; that they were merely phenomena, dependant on the organs perceiving them; he was most certainly right. But when he proceeded to infer that,

no external objects existed in nature to co-operate with the senses in the production of those phenomena, he was as certainly wrong. He appears to have been misled even by his own penetration; unless by the *absolute* existence of external objects, he meant the abstract existence of things independent of substance, space and time. But these are the modes, as I have said, of all natural existence; the god of nature alone and the supernatural beings more immediately dependent on him, existing independent of these.

"The Bishop indeed does admit the existence of the efficient causes of external objects, as ideas in some creative mind: but *thoughts* or beings *merely ideal* have no mechanical power, as external objects have. Their existence therefore cannot be *merely mental*; they must be *material*.

"The general mistake lies in our supposing those effects to be simple, independent and positive properties; which are only compound, dependent and relative. This is evident, from the necessity we lie under of calling the sensation in the organ, and the property in the object, by one and the same name: the same word always serving to express our idea of the object, as well as the object itself.

"No man, it is presumed, in his right mind will doubt the existence of this table. But what do we mean by a table? The idea of an object affecting our several senses in a certain particular manner. To the different perceptions it excites, we give the name of properties, and suppose them essential to the object. But as those properties are dependent on, and relative to the percipient organs, when the table is not perceived, those properties do not exist. And the table, *qua*tenus a table, is of course annihilated. But, the physical cause of the table, or the external causes of those effects which we call the properties of the table, still exist. *THEIR esse is not percipi*; *they* do not depend on the mental perception of the perceiving animal; but have their existence in nature, whether perceived or not.

"As we can by no means, however, investigate the nature of such abstract existence; so we have no other word to give to our idea of it, but still that of a table.

"So that we have here three several distinct objects, viz. the *palpable* object as it is actually perceived when present; the *ideal* object as conceived by the imagination when absent, and the *real* object, as it exists independent of the perceiving organs: to which three objects, however distinct and different, we are accustomed nevertheless, to give one and the same appellation. Is it to be wondered at, therefore, if the existence of external objects has been made the subject of dispute, or that it should be enveloped in the *darkness visible* of METAPHYSICAL OBSCURITY?

W.

Remarks

Remarks on the two last Chapters of Mr. Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire: In a Letter to a Friend. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Payne.

"Every true friend to Christianity, (says the author\* of these remarks) cannot but feel himself interested in the concluding chapters of Mr. Gibbon's History. It is much to be lamented, that 'the melancholy duty imposed upon the historian,' should have appeared to him so sacred, and indispensable. The validity of this plea may well be contested, should it be found, that one unhappy bias prevails throughout the whole course of his researches; that the Apologists of Christianity are vilified on every occasion; the objections of its adversaries industriously brought forward, and the testimonies in favour of our religion, sometimes wholly concealed, at other times misrepresented.

"The passages which I allude to, from the nature of the work itself, affect only, for the most part, the history of the first ages of Christianity. But there are also far too many oblique and ungenerous insinuations, which fail not to suggest their own proper inferences, and which affect materially the general credit of Christianity.

"The enemy himself in the mean time, often lies hid behind the shield of some bolder warrior; and shoots his invenomed darts under the protection of some avowed heretic of the age. It may be added, that the singular address of the historian has served even to make the laboured arguments of modern writers, coincide with the description of a remote period of antiquity; and has introduced many well-known objections to Christianity, which the refined scepticism of the present age claims for its own†. I shall endeavour, (continues our remarker) to oppose his oblique censures by open arguments; and shall enquire into the real weight of the objections, which he has thought fit to set before us, with the strictest candour."

There is so close a connection in our remarker's observations on his author, that we cannot make any extract from them that will prove satisfactory to the reader; whom we refer therefore to the pamphlet itself.

It may not be amiss, however, in justice to that excellent historian, to animadvert a little on what the remarker affirms to be the design and tendency of his researches and insinuations,

The

\* Dr. W.

† We are obliged to attribute to the present age, the invention of many metaphysical subtleties ‡, and perhaps of some arguments of another kind; but for the most part, even the licentiousness of modern infidelity, has been only able to revive old arguments, disguised under some new form. This is a truth, which must strike every one, versed in the history of infidelity, with the strongest conviction.

‡ We are sorry to observe the term *metaphysical subtleties* so often applied, by men of letters and ingenuity, to those necessary distinctions, which are essential to perspicuity of argument. As to their using the epithet *metaphysical* as a term of reproach, they might as well use *mathematical*, in the same sense: all logical reasoning, or rational argument, being in fact *metaphysical*. Rev.

The charge he brings against Mr. Gibbon, is by no means a light one. It is that of vilifying the advocates for *Christianity*; of industriously bringing forward all the objections that have been made to it; and of suppressing and misrepresenting the testimonies in favour of *our religion*. To do all which, he says, one unhappy bias prevails throughout the whole course of the work. The historian is accordingly charged with having wilfully vilified, objected to, and misrepresented the Christian religion.-----We wish our remarker had used a little *metaphysical subtlety* here, and been somewhat more explicit about what he means by *Christianity* and *our religion*. By any particular *religion*, we conceive to be generally understood a peculiar system of faith and morals, or of theoretical and practical piety, adapted at once to our duty to God, and our regard to man. By the *Christian religion*, therefore is meant that system of both, which is laid down in the Gospel as necessary to promote peace and good-will on earth, and to procure eternal happiness in Heaven. Does our author think these great objects dependant on the moral evidence to be adduced in favour of the historical truth recorded in the New Testament, or in any other history or record relating to the deeds of our Saviour, or the acts of his Apostles? Does he conceive a belief in mere historical facts, founded on *probable*, or (if he so chuses to call it) *positive* proof, to be that *saving* faith which the Scriptures represent as the conditions of salvation; as the terms of acceptance with the author and founder of our faith and practice in the Christian religion? Doth Dr. W. really think that if Mr. G. had even succeeded in invalidating the historical and moral evidence of, what the Doctor calls, Christianity, that Mr. G. would have, by so doing, (as Dr. W. states the case) been the means of “depriving one honest man of his “faith in Christianity? Of robbing that man of all his better “hopes, and taking from him that source of comfort, for which “he can offer him no equivalent?” Is it possible, we say, that Dr. W. can conceive such important objects, as the source of our comforts in this life, and our better hopes of another, to depend on a belief of any fact or series of facts, dependant on any species or degree of human evidence; the force of whose operation, on the mind of the individual depends so much on time, place, and circumstance; on which his own disposition and sentiments are also greatly dependant? Does he suppose the dispensation of grace entirely dependant on, instead of co-operating with the dispensations of Providence? Or does he suppose there is no peculiar dispensation of grace at all?—We ask these questions, because, to say the truth, if our remarker does not mean such an historical

\* See page 91 of the pamphlet before us.



faith, we do not rightly understand what he means by *his* Christian religion; and still less what he requires of Mr. Gibbon, when he says, "An opportunity will yet present itself, in the intended prosecution of his work, for making some atonement to the *"injured Genius*|| of Christianity."

But, however unnecessary our remarker may think the interposition of grace, or important the faith founded on moral evidence, we do not think he can fairly impute either an evil tendency to Mr. Gibbon's work, or a sinister design to the author; since he himself acknowledges, that if the historian had succeeded in proving all his positions, he could have done little if any harm.

"Let us, says he, turn back to estimate the true nature and force of his disquisitions, by supposing for a moment, the utmost success to have attended them.

"They contain an attempt to account for the growth of Christianity, from the end of the second century, by the aid of human causes. They tend to lessen the supposed numbers of the first Christians, while they unavoidably shew, at the same time, that their numbers were considerable. Other testimonies not adduced by our author, confirm the same idea†. They tend to apologise for the conduct of the Roman government, towards their persecuted subjects, but they no where assert that the Christians in general were guilty of such crimes as deserved the severest punishments. They tend to censure the uncharitable sentiments and the private vices of a few individuals, but they bear witness, in a general view, to "the pure" and austere morals of the Christians.‡"

"What then if our historian had succeeded, even in every one of his positions?

VOL. IV.

M m

We

|| As our Remarker cannot here irreverently mean our *Saviour* himself, he means, perhaps, some such genius or familiar, as Socrates and others of the ancient sages affected to think attendant on them. Or perhaps, in this age of *taste* and *genius*, it is the *genius of religion*, a proper companion to the *taste for devotion*, lately started by that captivating writer, the fawning devotee, Mrs. Barbauld. Rev.

† There is a very remarkable testimony, in particular, of the *Apostate* Julian, the declared enemy of Christianity. He supposes that there were in *many cities of Greece and Italy* multitudes of believers in *Jesus*, before John wrote his gospel. See the passage quoted by Dr Lardner, vol. iv. ch. xlvii. Though we may have some reason to suspect the zealous temper of Tertullian, of a degree of exaggeration, his testimony is yet too striking to be omitted. "*Hesterni sumus, & vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, senatum, forum; sola vobis relinquimus templa.*" Apolog. c. 36.

‡ To this *human* cause, much certainly may be attributed. Julian, the avowed enemy of Christianity bears honourable testimony to the manners of the first Christians, in attributing the success of the gospel, *principally* to this circumstance. He reproaches the Gentiles for not imitating their philanthropy, and their distinguished charity, in maintaining, besides their own poor, the poor of their enemies also. Τρεφουσι δε οι δυσσεβεις Γαλιλαιοι, προς τοις εαυτων, και τους ημετερους. Epist. xlix. edit. Paris 1630, 4to.

“ We had still remained in full possession of all the most important evidences of our religion of the evidence even of its MIRACULOUS PROPAGATION during the age of the apostles, and of the extraordinary continuance of it at least a century afterwards. We had still surveyed with pleasure the general characters of the first Christians, and we *had had* sufficient occasion to admire the amazing fortitude of some thousands of martyrs \*, and of a far greater number of confessors.

If then Mr. G. could have done so little harm to Christianity, even if he had fully succeeded in his supposed attempts against it; where is the Christian charity in supposing any such hostile attempt intended? For our part, we cannot see it; and though we readily subscribe to the encomiums our remarker pays to Mr. G. on account of his literary abilities, in the following passage, we cannot impute to him so bad a design as he is here reproached with.

“ In any case it would remain yet to achieve many other still more difficult labours, before the melancholy triumph, of having eradicated Christianity out of the minds of men, could be enjoyed by any one.

“ But what then, shall we say, if our author be found to have failed altogether in his attempts; if his several human causes are either inadequately or improperly alledged†; if his conjectures are ill-supported, and his arguments in general, weak and fallacious?—Christianity surely derives a new triumph on this, as well as on former occasions, from the unsuccessful attack that has been made upon it. However we may admire the talents of our author, we have but too much reason to lament the use he has made of them. His extensive researches into antiquity, and his polished style, interest us in his favour. But he is the less entitled to our thanks for the agreeable entertainment he has set before us, while it is our duty to complain of his ungenerous treatment of Christianity. The characters of his history at one time utters the most false imputations\*, at another, oppose

\* Our author's own calculation (the certainty of which we have had occasion to call in question) according to the annual consumption, of martyrs which he supposes to have taken place, in the course of one persecution only, amounts to near two thousand. (See p. 585.) Taking in every other persecution, we may safely say, many thousands.

† It may perhaps be remarked justly, that our author's own recapitulation of the five causes principally insisted on (p. 502) does not give that force to them, which the use they were intended for, requires. They are summoned. (p. 450) to account for the rapid growth of the Christian church. It appears in the end, that at the most, they can account only for the continuance, and defence of it. The first, we are told, inspired the Christians with that valour, which *disclosed to capitulate*; the three succeeding causes, ‘supplied their valour, with the most formidable arms’ the last, ‘united their courage, and directed their arms.’ Through the whole of this delineation, no other idea can be discovered, but that of a successful resistance to a persecuting enemy, not of a triumphant victory over them, without bloodshed, by making friends, of enemies.

\* Besides some other similar instances already pointed out, our author has not hesitated to close a sentence of praise, with the impious raileries of Celsus.

pose even the sacred truths of religion, with ridicule instead of argument; and use those weapons which are alone to be dreaded, because they are indirectly aimed.

"We have seen him influenced too often by the same malicious spirit; we have seen him, aiming the most deadly and unmerited blows, at the respectable character of a grave historian, and pleading the cause of paganism, with his utmost eloquence, as if retained in service by some lawful obligation. He has not, however, failed to remember that 'the wife of this world abuse 'in doubt and dispute 'their vain superiority of reason and knowledge†.' And this melancholy instance of human frailty, might perhaps have afforded an useful caution. May he enjoy, unenvied, the honourable triumph of being justly distinguished in the republic of letters! I cannot but add a wish, that he had secured to himself also the far nobler, heart-felt triumph of having benefited mankind, by using his endeavours to promote among them the only true 'system of love and harmony.'

We cannot but smile at the method which almost all our advocates for a system of *love and harmony*, take to establish it, viz. that of insisting that all other people should be of their own opinion; at the same time we smile just as much at the affectation both of Mr. G. and Dr. W. in pretending to despise the vanity of 'a superiority of reason and knowledge.' For goodness' sake, what is the great end of most writers, and the remarks on their writings? Is it not to display a superiority of reason and knowledge? At best, it is to profit the world, if not to gratify their own vanity by such display. So that the work itself cannot be accounted vain, whatever may be said of the writer.

---

*Letters on the American Troubles. Translated from the French of M. de Pinto. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Boosey.*

"After the many masterly productions on the subject of the American dispute, by writers on both sides of the question, it may perhaps be deemed superfluous to offer the following translation to the public.—But, as there are few natives of this country so entirely unbiassed as not to be warped by prejudice, or blinded by passion, the translator thought that the work of a foreigner, who must, necessarily be disinterested, would not be unacceptable to his countrymen in general; and the rather as M. Pinto is of deserved literary reputation."

Such is the apology of the translator; and, if it be a truth, (of which, however we do not see the necessity) that M. Pinto is really disinterested in every thing he advances respecting

M m 2

Great-

In the offensive language of this virulent enemy of Christianity, the *miraculous* birth of Christ, is represented to us as 'equivocal' and the life of him who WENT ABOUT DOING GOOD, is stigmatized as a 'wandering life.' (See p. 526.)

† P. 474.

Great-Britain and its settlements, his arguments certainly claim the attention of those among our countrymen who make any pretensions to candour and impartiality; although such arguments have not altogether novelty to recommend them. M. Pinto indeed observes, that truth ought to be repeated again and again, 'till she be acknowledged.

"In the opinion of Foreigners, says he, who are not acquainted with the unlimited resources of England, the most alarming point is, the enormous expence necessary to subjugate the rebels; and consequently "encreasing that common bug-bear, the national debt. We must first observe, that the English in general appear easy enough on that head. A proof that the bulk of the nation is but little alarmed at the state of things in America, is, that public credit is not at all hurt by it. It is true, that without this grievous event, *stocks* would be still higher. Nothing is more truly laughable, than to hear it said, that it is the Ministry which by gaming in the stocks upholds them. That ridiculous absurdity has been repeated, echo-like, by a thousand ignorant people, without adverting to the impossibility of it. It is a shame that in a commercial country as England is, such silly notions should be broached. Pecuniary people might, for example, be able to uphold for a time, against all endeavours to the contrary, the shares of the Dutch East India Company's stock, because there is a great deal more money than shares. With two or three millions of florins, all the shares might be bought which are not mortmain in Holland. It would be much more difficult to monopolize the shares of the English East India Company's stock, as they amount to several millions sterling. But as to the different government-funds, whose total amount is an hundred and twenty-eight millions sterling, dispersed in so many hands, there can be no possibility of keeping up their price, either by artifice or gaming. If public credit was not founded on a solid basis, the Ministry could never support it. Twenty five millions sterling, in real specie, would not be sufficient for it. Those who are acquainted with the temper of the English, know, on the contrary, that a panic which takes them sometimes, lowers the funds without any solid reason; but it is not possible to deceive them, when they think that they have good reason for their fears. It is a shame to be obliged to refute such an absurdity."

M. Pinto proceeds, however, to such refutation; though it be, as he confesses, a repetition merely of what he had advanced in his Essay on Circulation.

"One certain good," says this ingenious and sensible writer, "has ensued from the rebellion of the Colonies, as it has occasioned a thorough examination of the importance, utility, and inconveniences of them: our ideas were very vague before on that subject—but it has been examined, and searched into—and that object on which there were formerly so many various opinions, is now very well known and understood. At the end of the last war, nobody in England, some few East India directors excepted, knew the importance of

the British possessions in Indostan.—They wanted in a manner to sacrifice Asia to America; the contrary ought to have been done.—It is true that this erroneous plan has been in part amended; but before the preliminaries it might have been more perfect, more solid, and, I will venture to say, more beneficial for the contracting parties. Since that epoch some faults have likewise been committed, and perhaps there still remains some prejudices relative to the India Company; but certainly the territory possessed by the English in the East Indies ought to be looked upon as the richest gem of the crown; and as this important object presents itself to my pen, I shall give my sentiments on it; and the rather as it is closely connected with American affairs. It is but lately that the importance of the Indian possessions has been known. They are invaluable—provided that Government and the Company keep in their remembrance the apologue of the hen that laid golden eggs—They had very nearly verified the fable, by almost embowelling the hen; and the means which were afterwards used to remedy the evil, were not applied with all the art necessary to render them specific, salutary, just, and free from great inconveniences. At first the intoxication caused by the successes of the East India Company,—her riches exaggerated by those who had contributed to them, made them reap too soon the harvest which they should have left to ripen maturely. The company in 1766, before it had liquidated its debts, at once offered to Government four hundred thousand pounds sterling a year, in consideration of the revenue of the newly-acquired territorial dominions in the province of Bengal; and this hasty step of the directors and of the proprietors, occasioned by a blind impatience of having their dividends augmented, has sheltered Government from that censure which it would have incurred if the Ministers had prematurely and authoritatively required that exorbitant sum. It appears to my weak understanding that during the continuation of the Company's charter, and perhaps after its expiration, all that Government could have pretended to, with any justice, would have been a land-tax on the territorial revenue of Bengal, on the same footing as that levied in England; a step which would at once have obviated that great absurdity of *imperium in imperio*. These possessions have cost an immense sum to the Company. The proprietors have long suffered for it by a trivial dividend. It is partly at their expence that these acquisitions have been made; it was but just that they should in their turn reap the advantages accruing from them; but those happy days had hardly dawned for them, when they were again eclipsed by unforeseen accidents. Every body knows that the fear of the French troops, which in the year 1768 were in the island of Mauritius, involved the Company in a ruinous expence for fortifications and other military works, to the amount of three millions sterling: I leave it to be imagined how much its servants have abused their trust in using this circumstance as a pretext for the encrease of many other unnecessary expences. The directors, who could not possibly foresee the rebellion of the Americans, had ordered nine thousand ton of tea to be sent home, and not having been able to sell it, the price of it has consequently fallen, to the great detriment of the Company; which has besides suffered a further loss by the large quantities



quantities of it which have rotted in the warehouses : for the above reasons Government, on the repeal of the American stamp-act, should have laid a duty on any other article rather than on tea.

" The Company has been, on this occasion, the victim of the measures of government. It has, besides, had the additional charge of a shilling per pound to indemnify Government for the suppression of a shilling per pound duty taken off, in favour of the Americans. This new duty, jointly with the annual four hundred thousand pounds sterling became too heavy a burden. The consequences of this have been fatal. However these unlucky accidents were only of a temporary nature. Another unaccountable blunder, which the Company was guilty of at the time of the convention with Government, was, to engage to continue the payment of four hundred thousand pounds annually, which should only be lessened in proportion as the dividend of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. should be lessened, and not entirely to cease until the dividend was reduced to 6 per cent.—This was very unjust; for according to a list of the dividends one year with another, the English East India Company has always divided eight per cent.; but by this convention the proprietors have been reduced to the cruel alternative of either giving, in cases of accidents, forced dividends, or of being reduced all at once to 6 per cent."

Our author appeals to experience in the affair of the East-India company against what has been advanced by Mr. Bolt and others, on the subject; asserting the flourishing state of the company, notwithstanding all their over-sights and blunders in their bargains with administration, and the mismanagement of their servants.

" The Abbé Reynal, a celebrated and judicious author, has written on the subject of the Dutch East-India company : his materials were memoirs, which should appear to be faithful, since they were drawn up by persons who had been at the head of the company's affairs in the East-Indies. These memoirs, however, were written a long while before the publication of the Abbé's book. I acknowledge that it contains many curious, interesting, and true particulars, which are not to be found any where else. But several of the consequences which he draws are, nevertheless, false. One example will be sufficient. If the Dutch East-India company did not clear at the end of the year, more than two hundred and fifty thousand florins, *as is pretended*, it would have been insolvent long before now; for since the date of the memoir, included in the Philosophical History of the above-named author, the company has met with great losses by the war carried on in the island of Ceylon, and other incidents, and yet it is not ruined. Let the other consequences, deduced by the said memoirs, be also compared with recent events, and they will be found equally erroneous. The work of Mr. Howell is an historical picture of the affairs of Indostan, much more faithful and more comfortable for the English nation, than the caricatures of Mr. Bolt, or the memoirs which seduced the ingenious author of the Philosophical and Critical History of both the Indies.

" The

"The English and Dutch may meet with a check from the Indians; but whilst they preserve their power at sea, with a few troops they will always be able to master them. That indolent and effeminate people will always be mastered by the English, if other powers do not espouse their cause. This weakness of the Indians is the consequence of their climate, and of other physical and moral causes. It is even probable that the English will always have the superiority which their marine gives them over the other powers of Europe; and attacking that nation in Asia would I think, be like laying hold of the bull by the horns.

"Many people pretend that territorial possessions, and the wars which they occasion, are inconsistent with trade, and ruinous to the company—from this assertion I appeal to experience. After the catastrophe of the massacre of the English at Calcutta, the company, supported by the Admirals Watson and Pocock, revenged that outrage, by taking possession of the province of Orissa. That conquest and the revenues arising from it, have been the source of the prodigious success of the company in India, even against European enemies who appear to have superior force to what had ever been seen before in that country. This single observation seems to determine the question. But if there wants more proof, consider the extraordinary sums which government has received since that epocha, by the customs which have brought in almost double the four hundred thousand pounds a year, the dividend which the company have paid, the great expences it has been at in fortifications, the ease and quickness with which it surmounted the embarrassment of its affairs about three years ago; if all this does not demonstrate the utility of its territorial possessions, nothing can be demonstrated. The Dutch East-India company would be nothing without territorial possessions. The servants of the company, in that case, in India, strive to make a rapid fortune, in order the sooner to return home again. Means must be found to remedy this great evil. Such as fill the chief posts ought to have assurances from government and from the company, that they should be handsomely rewarded after ten years residence; but, to obtain that reward, their conduct ought to be strictly examined into, and they should be punished if they had behaved ill. This must be the basis of all the amendments that can be projected. I should think it advisable even to offer a premium of so much per cent. for those who should prove that they had cut off any useless expences, improved some branches of commerce, laid out money on some useful and important objects; for in great concerns, niggardliness and stinginess ought to be avoided with as much care as prodigality and lavishment—maxims that are little known in Holland.—Every thing that tends to hurt or distress the Indians ought to be carefully avoided and discouraged; they should be treated with mildness and humanity, but at the same time be made sensible that they are not feared, and that they would be punished with severity if they became perfidious. I repeat it, war should not be renewed in India out of wantonness, or to answer particular private purposes; but at the same time it ought not to be dreaded when it appears necessary.

Wars

Wars in India are of a different nature from any carried on in any other part of the world; humanity ought to prevail, and therefore the seducing advantages which an Indian war offers to some political eyes, should be renounced. The English East-India company being in possession of Bengal, Bahor, and Orisa, cannot but profit from the territorial revenue, by the receipt of the specie which other nations bring there to carry on their commercial transactions. It is therefore the interest of the English East-India company to suffer this trade to be carried on freely; whilst, on the other hand, the nations so permitted to trade should think themselves happy therein, as they are thereby free from military expences, which in their situation is a very great advantage; and they will do so, provided they are not blinded by jealousy, contrary to the reciprocal interest of all the parties. I recommend it to the proprietors of both the English and Dutch companies not to lose sight of this great, this important truth.

“There are people who take a pleasure in reporting, that at the expiration of the term of the charter, government will take the territorial revenue from the company; and by this absurd report, which I hold to be without foundation, the price of India stock is kept low, I must observe, by the by, that even if this was to be the case, the price of the stock ought to rise; for it is not under a government mild and free, like that of England, that the company should be dispossessed of an estate acquired at its own expence and risk, without making a compensation for it: it is their property. But why should I refute chimeras? The British government knows that all that has been written against the exclusive trade of the company, treating it is a ruinous monopoly, are political sophisms, which have hitherto always been contradicted by experience. It is ridiculous to call the commerce of the English or Dutch companies a monopoly. They procure the subsistence of millions of people, they are the source of the riches of the two states; the fortunes which their servants make in India *per fas & nefas*, always turn to the profit of the state, therefore cannot be called a monopoly. This commerce is of such a nature as to be better directed by a company than by individuals. The Dutch were sensible of this when their company was established. Experience and good sense have always confirmed them in that system, and they are happy in never having had its propriety called in question. The trade of separate individuals would be ruinous; because the more competitors there are in India for the purchase of goods, the dearer the commodities are, and in proportion to the quantities of goods brought into Europe, do their prices rise or fall; and individuals would pay no regard to these circumstances. Besides, this is a trade which of late has more or less been carried on by force of arms: for which reason it can only be successful to a company. Let us now come to the produce of the territory.

If government took from the company the produce of the territory, confining it only to the trade, the revenue would run the risk of losing annually above two millions sterling well secured, and this for the sake of adopting a precarious and doubtful system. The duties which  
the

the company pays to the customs have nearly doubled since 1763—this is a fact well known.

“ This augmentation of duties amounts to above four hundred and fifty thousand pounds sterling. This overplus proceeds from the considerable returns, and the prodigious sales of the company, which would be totally impossible to be made, if it was deprived of its territorial revenue: it could no more make such large investments, and the sales would decrease considerably to the great detriment of trade. Government would suffer (besides any other losses) by thus stopping the sources of its finances. The East India company, far from being a monopoly, gives life by its navigation, exportation, and sales to all classes of the state. Its commerce protects and enriches them; but all these benefits are returned with ingratitude; that vice too common in the world—Besides, how would government get the territorial revenue remitted to Europe? It would be absolutely impossible. Specie cannot be brought out of India without a very great loss; and if this was to be done, in that case it would be found out only a possible way of draining that country of its riches. It follows then, indubitably, that the territorial revenue cannot be brought to Europe advantageously, otherwise than in goods, by the traffic of the company. This operation is more to the interest of government than of the company; which, by means of this territorial revenue increases its sales, and consequently its commerce, which increases the royal revenue by a hundred different ways, independently of the augmentation of the custom-house duties.\*

“ The share of the territorial revenue which government might pretend to, ought to be very moderate; in order to avoid the fate of him who killed the hen that laid golden eggs—Government ought to watch over the establishments in the East Indies, and the economical administration of the directors, to be constantly correcting rising abuses to stop their progress, for there will always be some, and it is their excesses and consequences which ought to be prevented. The revenue which government draws from the company is very considerable; and equity requires that the proprietors, who have suffered so much, should soon feel the good effects of the present opulence of the company.”

“ We have heard it affirmed that M. Pinto receives an annual compliment of five hundred pounds from our East-India company\*, for having exerted his political and literary talents in their behalf; if this be true, he cannot be well called a disinterested writer, even though his arguments should be valid in favour of his clients.

S.

\* It is then as clear as the day, that it is the interest of Great Britain that the charter of the company should be continued for several years, and it is the only means by which the finances can most profit. All other methods are only chimerical and ruinous projects, supported only by declamation, which experience shows to be contrary to the true principles of trade and finance.

† A circumstance, however, that we know nothing of but by hearsay.

*Medical Researches: being an Enquiry into the Nature and Origin of Hysterics in the Female Constitution, and into the Distinction between that Disease and Hypochondriac or Nervous Disorders. Comprehending a Specification of the characteristic Refinement and Excellence of the Female Constitution and Character. A Research into the Materiality of these occult Powers and Principles of Activity, commonly called Life in the human Frame.—Into the real Existence of an Image of our whole organical Frame, in the Seat and Fountain of its Powers, and the physical Probability of there being a Regeneration of that Image in Organs formed for the Transfusion and Multiplication of individual Life. The true Nature, Symptoms, and Indications of Cure of the Hysterical Disease. The Abuse of Sagar as a Cause of its increased Frequency, and the increased Frequency of Infant Mortality. The precise Seat of Animal Heat. The Structure of the Blood. Practical Hints, relative both to the Hysterical and Hypochondriacal Diseases, and the Management of them, &c. &c. Together with the Substance of a Discourse, proving that the Motions of the Blood and Animal Fluids, do not depend upon the Impulses of the Heart upon the Blood, but must be referred to other Causes, and particularly to an animal Modification of that universal Principle which is the common Cause of all Organisation, and of all organical Motions in Bodies. To which are added, Four Letters to Sir Hildebrand Jacob, on the Materiality, Density, and Activity of Light; and on Air. By Andrew Wilson, M. D. Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians at Edinburgh, and Physician to the Medical Asylum, London. 8vo. 6s. Hooper. (Continued from Page 199.)*

We have received a letter, concerning this work, reproaching us with having "sighted it, as a mere medical tract; whereas it contains a more profound and novel investigation of the first principles of natural philosophy than ever was offered to the public." Our correspondent appears too precipitate in his reprehension; especially as, in our former article, we intimated a design of continuing our animadversions on it; at least on the author's letters to Sir Hildebrand Jacob on light and air. That we may not be wanting, however, in paying a due regard to the labours of the really ingenious, we shall take a little more notice than we at first intended of the work in general. So ample a title-page, which we did not before think necessary to print, will alone serve as a table of contents. Of the author's design, with respect to the disclosing of his new principles in philosophy, we shall give our readers what he himself says in his address to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge on the subject.

"The



"The old physicians of the Galenical and Peripatetic schools satisfied themselves with the four elements, the four occult qualities, and the four temperaments generated out of these, with which they tempered up the known materials of our frame, so as to satisfy their own ideas of all its various operations and functions.

"When these were discovered to be insufficient (unjust I cannot call them, so far as they went) for erecting a Scientific system of medicine upon, the assistance of mechanical philosophy, when it was revived, was engrossed to assist in carrying on the work; and besides the general laws of gravitation and attraction, the laws of mechanics and hydraulics became applied to the animal system, and had assigned to them their share of the work; and as new phenomena, distinctions, and terms for them, occurred in the philosophical researches of the learned, these came all in their turn to be engrossed also into the system of human nature: elective affinities, electricity, animal irritation, spasm, fixable air, and last of all, life, as a principle, took their shares, or rather their successive turns as reputed causes of the phenomena that appeared in the animal system.

"The greatest objection that can be made to this fluctuation in physiology is, that as new principles came to be assumed, former ones were forgotten and neglected; as if their efficiency ceased immediately, like old ministers in a state, upon the introducing of new ones. If succeeding enquiries both in philosophy and physiology, had retained in their view the placita of their predecessors, as circumstances not to be lost sight of or neglected, though not to be assumed as principles, the faculty would have attained the end of their enquiries more certainly, than by being so intent on their own discoveries, as to neglect as rubbish, all these circumstances that were formerly of so much moment.

"I have often been surprised at the short-sightedness of philosophers in this respect, who by such a procedure have often rowed themselves back again into the port they set out from, when they thought themselves landed on the coast of a *terra incognita*.

"We have an eminent instance of this in the present physiology. Nothing has been long thought more contemptible in the old theory of medicine, than the doctrine of the four occult qualities. We have made a long voyage from that port, through all the mechanical and other principles of modern philosophy; we have touched at the fortunate islands of electricity, irritability, fixed air, spasm, &c. and at present we are landed again at heat, an occult effect of life, an occult principle, resident in the animal solids.—Is this any thing different from heat, one of the four occult qualities? When it becomes even a doctrine of the schools, that animal solids, in consequence of essential matter becoming such, possess heat as a quality; and other new unknown properties, which the matter they are formed of contained not before; it becomes highly requisite to to pay some attention to that essential part of our frame, capable of displaying all these supposed principles, which has lain so long in obscurity.

"With all the extravagance and absurdities of the alchemists, and the other first cultivators of chymistry, they are the only sect of physicians who seem to have extended their views to that elementary part

of our constitution, which only can discharge all these phenomena and functions in it that have been reduced to last principles, only because our extent of knowledge in mechanics cannot solve them.

"All their visionary projects for obtaining the philosopher's stone, the alcahest, universal menstruum—the universal medicine, &c. proceeded upon at least a rational presumption, that every substance in nature had a seminal origin, or was generated out of materials so animated, as to act upon other proper substances, by assimilating them to its nature. This seminal virtue, they supposed lay in an animation of the materials they wrought upon in such a manner, that the elementary anima they proposed to introduce into, and fix in it, should act so as to reduce proper substances presented to it, into the same organization and structure with the seminal ferment.

"Whether any of these philosophers ever made gold or not, or whether it lies within the compass of art to generate a seminal virtue of any kind in matter or not, is not the question: yet, certainly, they philosophised justly in supposing that all formal bodies were generated by a seminal virtue, and in supposing that that seminal virtue lay in the animation of bodies so as, by the substance of fire, to qualify it, in such organs, to assimilate other terrestrial materials under proper circumstances into their character; in the same manner as, in the animal oeconomy, blood carried into bones, becomes bone, into cartilages, cartilage, into flesh, flesh, and into ligaments, ligament.

"The most excellent Boerhaave, who understood well the doctrine and principles of the alchymists, in his *Analysis of Fire*, has outdone all others in his endeavours to establish the universality and importance of this element, and to strip it of its mystic dress. It would have been impossible for philosophers since, to have thought of introducing an aether, or an electrical fire of unknown origin and properties distinct from this, or to have resolved so many of its subtle effects into immaterial virtues accreting to bodies, and adyta of natural substances, which it was profane to look into, or to attempt to interpret or refer to that matter, and these powers of it, which may be perceived to preside in and over all natural things.

"Though the most obvious phenomena in nature tend to ascertain beyond doubt, that the matter of common light or fire pervades all nature, and fills all things; yet the whole has been overlooked as an accidental filtration that implied no consequences, nor interfered with the various unintelligible properties of bodies, which they possessed independent of it, notwithstanding its inevitable access to their innermost penetralia.

"It is evident, that the natural omnipotence of light depends on the sun. By him, in a natural sense, the matter of light or of fire as his issue, is omnipresent and all-sufficient. If the life of all things depends on the activity he communicates to them; must not, then, that be the very influence that generates and maintains that life in all its septic characters, in every being according to its kind?

"This

"This globe is only an accumulation of terrestrial materials introduced into this boundless ocean of solar fluid, for a theatre on which to display its inexhaustible energy and powers, in consequence of the mass being so disposed and arranged by its author, as to become a seminal bed of materials for it to pierce, animate and display an endless variety and succession of beings and life in. Without any similar forms or properties in itself, this fluid is capable of extricating all the forms and generating all the powers of nature out of the materials provided for it to possess.

"It is this fluid that in some parts of the following discourses, I mean to point out, and recommend to the attention of every candid and discerning enquirer, as that part of our substance which is the real material substratum of the universal properties belonging to us as terrestrial matter; of the generical properties that constitute us animals, and of the specific ones which characterize us human creatures. This substance, I apprehend, it is that impresses and feeds the diversified similarities of the different parts of our composition, and the characteristic signs and marks of our individuality; while by a virtual concurrence and subtilisation of all these in the seat of consciousness, it generates our senses, our passions, our habits, our volitions, and the powers subservient to them; in short, that whole focal concentration of life correspondent with every part of our form, whose incessant energy supports every vital, natural and animal function in our constitution.

"The discourse on the causes of the circulation of the blood is so necessarily connected with the same system of views, and tends so directly to illustrate the necessary accessoriness of this vital element of our constitutions, to the discharge of that important work, which, hitherto, generally, the mechanical shocks and impulses of the heart, and of arteries, have been deemed sufficient to execute, that I judged the annexing of the substance of that Lecture, requisite to the illustration of the views principally offered to the consideration of the public in this Treatise."

That neither this writer nor his friends may have reason to complain, we have here displayed his design in his own words; by which, at the same time, we must confess we do not always perfectly understand his meaning. His observations on the ineffectual mode of philosophizing in others, have their weight, without being attended with that force of conviction, or perspicuity of expression which should give a preference to his own.

We do not comprehend, in particular, the nature of that *seminal virtue* which lies in the animation of bodies; or that of the *substance*, he calls *light* and *fire*; and, still less, what he means by the *natural omnipotence of light* depending on the *sun*.---We should be sorry, however, that any want of comprehension in us should be the cause of misrepresenting the author; we shall therefore submit the greater part of his third chapter, in which the general principles of his system are farther developed, to the mature deliberation of the philosophical reader.

"The

*"The Sideral Part of the Constitution of all Terrene Bodies, and of the human Frame in particular."*

"If I cannot deliver my sentiments on this subject with sufficient conviction, I will at least endeavour to do it as explicitly, and with as much precision as I can.

"So many occult qualities, inscrutable principles, and indeterminate powers have been, and are, by ancients and moderns, introduced into a co-operation with the materials and mechanism of the animal frame, that it is become impossible to define or conceive, what we are supposed to be a composition of, or wherein animal life consists.

"The whole, in my opinion, is the result of, and ought to be referred to material mechanism; and my reason for this conclusion is,

"If all these, commonly supposed occult qualities of activity and unintelligible symptoms of power and energy resident in, or annexed to, different material substances did not depend on mechanism and that only, then it would be impossible that such virtues could be either generated or destroyed.

"Philosophy does not suppose that mechanism can affect such properties of bodies, as belong to them independant of it. Mechanism, or a new distribution and arrangement of materials could not in that case generate elasticity out of non-elastics or plastics, electrics out of non-electrics, or concoct life, and the various seemingly unrelated symptoms of vitality in the animal composition, out of materials that are endowed with none of these principles. But the fact is, that Nature\* seems to have an unlimited power of inverting and changing, and generating all the specific qualities of bodies according to the modulation of the material organs that it occupies.

"Materially, the living animal frame consists of two parts.—Organically, it is distinguishable into three parts.

"That ingenious old physician and philosopher, Tachenius, reduced all the natural principles of things into acids and alkalis; the one the soul, the other the body of every natural substance.

"Change the terms, and the truth of his doctrine will become both more evident and more intelligible.

"Every material being, through all the forms of nature that have been, are, or can be known, is a composition of Celestial and of Terrestrial matter. This distribution of matter into these two classes, which is the real key of all natural knowledge, not only distinguishes this globe from the celestial fluid in which it swims, but it is to be applied to every individual, terrestrial substance; which must be considered as an intimate composition of these two elements; the latter being the organ or case of the energy of the former, and the modifier of its incessant activity; while the former impresses these characters on the latter, which are known by the name of the distinguishing properties of different bodies.

"For almost these forty years past, the curious have been teasing this celestial matter with the varied experiments and tricks of electricity,

\* By NATURE, I would always be understood to mean, these subtle principles of the mechanism of the world, and of all material things which are insensible as to causes, and discover themselves sensibly, only by their effects.

tricity, with so little success, as not to have yet ascertained that it is the one omnipresent animating principle of all natural things, upon which every property and phenomenon of material being, under all the metamorphoses and transfigurations that natural bodies undergo, depends; and without which, all that we call body, would remain for ever an inactive, passive, incoherent calx.

" This celestial matter is no other than the fluid of Light; which, according to the variety of the phenomena by which its energy has been discovered to us, has been called under different circumstances, light, fire, ether, electrical aura, *materia subtilis*, *materia media*, &c. and which at other times, has been stripped of its materiality all together, and treated as a principle annexed to, or inherent in matter, under the terms of, occult quality, *nîsus*, attraction, gravitation, elective attraction, elasticity, irritability, sympathy, vital principle, life, &c. &c.

" I said, that organically considered, the animal living frame was distinguishable into three parts; namely, solids, fluids, and an ethereal form which animates every particle of each of these in our composition.

" This celestial part of our constitution exists in us, and indeed in every other form in nature, in two modes; namely—interstitially and organically.

" If the pores of gold itself, the densest of all known earthly substances, exceed its solid or earthly parts, how much greater must the proportion of solar fluid in our composition be, than in that of gold? Let me illustrate my meaning by an example of the most simple of all known bodies, namely, the element of water; which, when perfectly pure, consists, so far as human analysis or penetration can discover, of perfectly similar parts.

" In the form of water, those similar parts which constitute the fluid must have interstices between them, even admitting them to be all in contact with one another. Water, by its transparency certifies our sense, that light has free access into and through its substance, and therefore must fill up these interstices, just as water does a sponge soaked in it.

" But we know, by the volatilisation of water, that light or fire, has not only access to its interstices, but penetrates and occupies its similar elementary particles also; in the conformation of which particles, the character of water consists. These particles could not be rendered volatile but by internal dilatation, nor could they be dilated but by something that reached their internal parts.

" These particles then are the organical parts of water, which have their individuality as separable elementary parts, as well as their similarity of character, preserved by that ethereal principle possessing them.

" These points being cleared, they yield a clear and obvious solution of all those obscurities with which present physiologists puzzle themselves, and seem disposed to resolve into some incomprehensible mystery; such as, What is the principle of life? Wherein does it consist? Where,—in the solids or in the fluids,—does it reside? Is it



not plain, that both must be necessarily the immediate organs and receptacles of it; and that each must be equally accessory in every point of our frame, to the support of its vivacity in the other \*?

"The vital state of this ether in our fluids, lies not abstractly in the degree of heat it exhibits in animals: For heat ascertains the quantity only, but not the modification of the motion of that fluid in animals. It lies not in any permanent properties in the component parts of our fluids; but it lies in that species and modification of its motion, by which the actual constant progressive mutations of the fluids are carried on, of which the maintenance of the animal heat is a necessary consequence.

"Whenever the fluids have passed through that series of mutations or digestions, which the vital ether accomplishes according to the modifications of the diverse parts in and according to which it acts, then they are either fixed as solids, where any parts will admit of them, or they are expelled as recrementitious subjects become effete, and whose vital modifications are exhausted.

"By the medium and instrumentality of the solids, indeed, the vital principle celebrates these functions, acts in these directions, and with that stability which could not be attained by fluids alone, though their incessant co-operation in their vascular state is essentially necessary to those functions of vitality that immediately depend on these solids.

"In short, by the unremittent, reciprocal corruscations of this vital principle in the fluids and solids upon one another, according to the different qualities and consistencies they assume in the different parts of our constitution, is the whole system of life displayed and maintained in every individual."

That we may not again be accused of doing this writer injustice, we shall, ourselves, also, take another month to reconsider the premisses here advanced, and to judge of the conclusions, to which the author proceeds in consequence of them.

[To be concluded in our next.]

R.

*The Philosopher in Bristol* 8vo. 2 vols. 5s. Robinson.

The Bristol philosopher resembles a real philosopher just as a Bristol stone resembles a diamond: between which, however some people, may not be able to distinguish the difference. This seems to be the case with this author's friends, as he calls them; who requested him to publish his reveries.

*Interesting*

\* Modern physiology has bewildered the ideas and conceptions of pupils in the science of medicine, by not distinguishing between the term *life*, used metaphysically for our system of consciousness, or as a result of our whole composition, explicable only by the Creator; and the same term used physically to denote the natural power that presides in our frame, reciprocally regulating, and regulated by the mechanism and disposition of the whole, and of every part and particle of our corporeal frame.

*Interesting Letters of Pope Clement XIV. (Ganganelli) to which are prefixed Anecdotes of his Life. Translated from the French Edition, published at Paris by Lottin, Jun. 2 Vols. 12mo. 6s. Becket.*

The anecdotes prefixed to these letters, appear to be extracted from Caraccioli's account of the Life of Ganganelli, of which we gave an extract in our last Review. As to the letters themselves, they are most of them written, also, in much the same stile of moderation and mediocrity as the examples we then gave of this pontiff's epistolary correspondence. To say the truth, it is with reason the authenticity of many of these letters may be questioned;\* although it be as certain that some of them bear indubitable marks of their being genuine. Not that we do not find ourselves in some degree disappointed, on the whole, in our expectations of what the literary and philosophical character of Ganganelli so flatteringly promised. It is, probably, owing to the universality of this prepossession that these letters have met with that astonishing sale on the continent, which, the editor, M. Caraccioli says, sufficiently proclaims their merit. To use his own words, "Le debit de ces lettres, qu'on peut appeller une *explosion*, est sans contredit leur plus bel éloge." We are of a very different opinion; thinking the *explosion*, with which Lord Chesterfield's Letters have lately gone off, in England, may be pleaded with equal propriety as an unexceptionable proof of similar desert: whereas, we regard both as only a proof of the extensive prevalence of popular prejudice, and the vitiated taste and superficial judgment of the multitude.

In France and Italy, indeed, it may be regarded as a kind of phenomenon for an ecclesiastic to throw off the trammels of the church, and to talk a little rationally on religious matters. The singularity of a Pope's doing this, might well, therefore, awaken the public curiosity, and attract the attention of the European continent. Setting the character and station, however, of the author aside, we find nothing new or extraordinary in this extraordinary writer's sentiments and reflections. At least, an English reader, accustomed to the free and liberal modes of thinking familiar to this country, will find a sufficient quantity of what we are used to term *common place*, to depress the height of admiration, with which they are recommended to his attention. Considered as the letters of a kind of *protestant* POPE, nevertheless, they are certainly curious; and, if it be true, as a celebrated writer observes, that people in general want more to be reminded than instructed, these epistles may prove, without the

VOL. IV.

O o

advantages

\* An intimation of which we gave the reader, in announcing the publication of the French version of these letters; said to have been written originally in Latin or Italian.

advantages of either novelty, or profundity of thinking both useful and entertaining to the reader.—The following is an epistle to an English My-Lord; who must have been as superficial as many Lords are, if he was struck with any thing either new or profound, either in the religion or philosophy of his Holiness.

## LETTER CXIX.

TO MY LORD \* \* \*.

“ I have not been accustomed to see such a genius as your’s become the dupe of modern philosophy. Your understanding should set you above the sophistry it engenders, and which levels us to the sad condition of the brutes.

“ If there is a God, as nature cries aloud through all her works, there must be a Religion. If there is a Religion, it must be incomprehensible, sublime, and as ancient as the world, as being an emanation from an infinite and eternal Being. If these are its characters, it must be Christianity; and if it is Christianity, it must be acknowledged to be divine, and heart and soul should acquiesce in it.

“ Is it then credible that God Almighty should display this Universe in such splendor, to feed the eyes with flocks of men and beasts, that ought to be confounded together, as having all the same destiny; and that this intelligence which dwells in us, which combines, which calculates, which extends beyond the earth, which mounts above the firmament, which recollects the ages past, and penetrates into those which are to come, and has an idea of that which ought to last for ever, should shine forth one moment, only to be dissipated afterwards like a feeble vapour?

“ What is that voice which incessantly proclaims within you, that you were born for great things? What are those desires which continually renew themselves, and which make you feel that there is nothing in this world which can occupy the wishes of your heart?

“ When man estrangeth himself from God, he is like a sick wretch rolling in agony, and the light of his reason, which he extinguisheth, leaves him in the midst of a darkness which is replete with horror.

“ The same truth which assures you of your own existence; I would say that intimate testimony which you find within yourself, assures you of the existence of a God, and cannot give you a lively idea of him, without impressing you with an idea of Religion. The worship which we render to the Supreme Being, is so linked with him, that our heart is not satisfied but when it is rendering homage to him, or conforming to the order which he hath established.

“ If there is a God, he ought naturally to be beneficent; and if he is beneficent, you ought, by the justest consequence, to thank him for his benefits. Neither your existence nor your health comes from yourself: about seven-and-twenty years ago, you *was* nothing, when all on a sudden you became an organised body, enriched with a soul to act as master, to command and guide it according to its will and pleasure.

This

"This reflection engages you to seek for the Author of life; and when you will examine, you will find him in your self, and in every thing which surrounds you, without any one of these objects being able to boast of their being a part of his substance; for God is single and indivisible, and cannot therefore be identified with the elements.

"If the religion which he hath established hath taken different forms, and has been since perfected by the coming of the Messiah; it is because God hath treated it as he has done our reason, which at first was only a feeble ray; but afterwards, disclosing itself by degrees, at last appears in the brightest light.

"Besides, is it for man to interrogate the Deity with regard to his conduct? Is it for a creature to regulate the ways of his Creator, and to prescribe a manner of operating to him? God communicates himself to us in part, but still reserves to himself the right of absolute dominion, because there is nothing but what is truly subject to him. If he clearly manifested his designs to us here below, if the mysteries which astonish and confound us were laid open to our view, we should have that intuitive sight which he reserves till after this life, and death would then be unnecessary. Evidence is only for Heaven, *cognoscam sicut & cognitus sum*\*: yet we would anticipate that moment, without reflecting that every thing is regulated by Infinite Wisdom, and that we have nothing to do on our part, but to submit and to adore. The unbeliever changes nothing of the designs of God, when he dares to rise up against him †. He even enters into his plan, that comprehensive plan, where the evil concurs with the good for the harmony of this world, and for the happiness of the next.

"Religion and nature are equally derived from God; and both the one and the other, though in different manners, have their mysteries and their incomprehensibilities; and by the same reason that the existence of nature is not denied, though its operations are often concealed, Religion cannot, nor ought not to be rejected, on account of its obscurities.

"There is nothing here which hath not a dark side; because our soul, weighed down by a body which oppresses and darkens it, is not capable of seeing every thing. It is in a kind of infancy here below, and should have light in proportion to the weakness of its sight, till death disengages it from the oppressive load which weighs it down. It is like a tender bird which pants and cries in its nest, till it can spring up into the air, and take its natural flight.

"The progress of Religion is admirable, in the eyes of a true Philosopher. It is at first seen like a twilight issuing from the bosom of Chaos; then like Aurora it announces the day; which at last appears, but surrounded with clouds, and cannot manifest itself in meridian brightness, until the Heavens shall be opened.

O o 2

"Hath

\* I shall know God, as I am known by him.

† How does this agree with what the writer says in letter xc. 'All the world knows that we too often resist the holy spirit, and that mankind daily defeat the intentions of the deity, by their wicked ways?'

“Hath then the unprincipled unbeliever any thing in particular which tells him, that what we believe is chimerical? At what time, and in what place has this secret light come to shine upon him? Is it in that moment when his passions ingulph and govern him? Or is it in the midst of public shews and pleasures, where he commonly passes his life?

“It is astonishing, my Lord, how men give up all the authority of tradition, and elude all the strength of the greatest testimonies, to refer blindly to two or three people who give them lessons of infidelity. They will not allow of inspiration, yet they look on those people as oracles; from whence it may be easily concluded, that nothing but their passions can attach them to infidelity. They abhor a Religion which restrains them when they would follow the torrent of their vices, and swim in the midst of the waves of a world agitated with foaming billows.

“Christianity is a superb picture traced out by the hand of God, and which he presented to man while it was yet but sketched, till the moment Jesus Christ came to finish it, waiting the time when he should give it the lustre and colouring it is to bear throughout eternity.

“Then religion will be the only object to engage our attention, because it will be then in the essence of God himself, making, as St Augustine expresseth it, *a whole with him*.

“This progress is conformable to that of the time which constitutes this life, and which does not exist but by succession. God has thus varied the forms of religion, because we are in a variable world; but he will fix it unalterably in heaven, because there no change will be known. These are the combinations and proportions which display the wisdom of the Supreme Being. Religion being for man, it was his pleasure that it should follow the progress made by man, according to the different modes of his existence.

“They who are intent upon this world, see nothing of all this; but you would judge of these things as I do, if you were disengaged from all the pleasures and all the riches which make you a materialist, in spite of yourself. Christianity is spirit and life; and they stray widely from it, who are occupied only about what is corporeal. Souls become enlightened at death, only because they are no longer weighed down by bodies which besiege and darken them. True philosophy, in disengaging man from whatever is carnal, does what death will finally effect; but it is not the modern philosophy, which acknowledges no existence but that of matter, and looks upon metaphysics as a science purely chimerical, although much more certain than physics, which has only its existence in the senses.

“I do not enter into the proofs of religion, because they have been so often and so well explained already in immortal works, that I could only repeat them. Jesus Christ is the beginning and the end of all things, the key of all the mysteries of grace and nature; so that it is by no means surprising that we should stray after a thousand absurd systems, when we do not steer by that sublime compass. I cannot give you a reason for any thing in physics or in morals, as Cardinal

nal



nal Bembo wrote to a philosopher of his time, if you do not admit of Jesus Christ. Even the creation of this world is inexplicable, incomprehensible, and impossible, if it was not effected by the incarnate word; for God can have no other intention in what he does, but what is infinite. This is the reason why St. John called our Saviour *Alpha and Omega*; and that the apostle told us that the ages were made by him: *Per quem fecit et secula*.

"Study, then, as much as a creature is capable, this Man-God, and you will find all the treasures of science and wisdom in him; you will observe that he is the first link of that chain which bindeth all things visible and invisible; and you will acknowledge him to be that divine breath which inspires justice and holiness into all hearts.

"The unbeliever can never give a satisfactory answer, when you ask him, Who is this Jesus Christ, this Man at the same time so simple and so divine; so sublime and so humble? so pure in the whole course of his life? so great in the moment of his passion? so magnanimous at his death? but to answer this question without evasion. If he is only a man, he is an impostor; for he hath said he was God; and from that time, what becomes of his sublime virtues? what becomes of his Gospel, in which he forbids the use of the least equivocation? and how account for his disciples' victories in all parts of the world? And if he is a God, what ought we to think of his religion, and those who dare to combat it?

"Ah! my Lord, behold what is better to know, and better to examine, than all the profane sciences which you study. Sciences will be at an end: *Linguae cessabunt, scientia destruetur*\*; and there will be nothing but the knowledge of Jesus Christ, which will ride triumphant upon the abyss, when time and the elements shall be swallowed up.

"Consider but yourself, and that view will necessarily lead you to truth. The smallest motion of your finger declares the action of God upon your body; this action announces a Providence; this Providence informs you that you are dear to your Creator; and this information leads you from truth to truth, till you come to those which are revealed.

"If you are neither the creator of yourself, nor your own ultimate end, you ought necessarily to search for Him in whom these two qualities subsist. And what can that be, if it is not God?

"Religion will be always sure to gain her cause in the eyes of all those who have principles. It is sufficient to remount to its source, to analyse and investigate the ends of its institution, to come at the truth: but the wicked dishonour and disfigure it, and substitute a skeleton in its place. I am not surprised, then, that they who are not instructed, and who put their trust in the false philosophy of the age, should look upon it as a bug-bear.

"My Lord, I expect from the rectitude of your soul, and the extensive powers of your mind, a more solid judgment than what

you

\* Languages shall cease, and Science be destroyed.

you have hitherto held with regard to Christianity, Shake off all these systems, and all the opinions with which you have been unfortunately biassed; enter like a new man into the way which tradition will open to you, and you will judge very differently; appeal from your prejudices to yourself; for as yet it has not been yourself; that has pronounced any opinion upon this subject. As for my part, I say what my heart and soul dictate to me, when I assure you of all the affection with which I shall remain, during life,

Yout Servant, &c. The CARD. GANGANELLI.  
Rome, 29th November 1768.

We cannot take leave of these letters without observing that the *English* translation from the French, is but indifferent: of the merit of the French translation from the original we are not furnished with the means of forming any proper judgment.

S.

*On the Origin of Language. Vol. III. 8vo. 6s. Cadell.*  
[Continued from page 191.†]

Having endeavoured to prove that human society is not natural, but the result of habit; or that it is not coeval with man, but must have had a beginning subsequent to his primeval state, our learned and ingenious author goes on to investigate the modes of its commencement. The same cause, says he, that first produced ideas, and made men rational creatures, made them also social and political beings; producing, in process of time, all the arts of life; which cause was nothing but the necessities of human nature, such as the want of subsistence, and of defence; without one or other of which, we are told, there never would have been either society, language or arts among mankind.

That Necessity is the mother of *Invention*, is proverbial; but that Necessity is the mother of *Reason*, or that the necessities of human life originally made men rational creatures, is a doctrine too singular to be admitted on slight proof, and requires more consideration than we have time at present to bestow on it. It must be owned, at the same time, that our author maintains his argument with singular ingenuity, and obviates the most prompt objections that might be made to it, with much dexterity. At present, it appears to us, nevertheless, to be rather specious than solid, his illustrations, in like manner, affording much more entertainment than conviction.

In the third book, the author treats of the nature of the first languages, with the progress, division, and derivation of languages,

†In the former part of this article, page 186, instead of *La Sarre's*, read *Sounerat's* late account of the Manillas,

guages; in doing which he displays a considerable share of metaphysical knowledge, as well as the force of his attachment to the ancient Greek philosophy; perhaps more than may be thought quite necessary to the elucidation of his subject.

In the second volume of this elaborate performance our philosophical philologist proceeds to examine into the nature and structure of language in its present state of artificial improvement; a state, to which, he says, it could never have arrived, from the rude materials of barbarism, which constituted the first efforts of articulation among savages, without great exertions of ingenuity and invention. In this part of the work, we conceive the writer, by too servile an attention to the distinctions made in the Categories of Aristotle, has in many places rather confused than cleared up his subject. He ascribes also, in our opinion, too much merit to the structure of the ancient languages, in respect to their terminations and inflexions; which may possibly recommend them to a poetical ear, on account of their euphony of sound, but will never recommend them to a philosophical understanding on account of their preciseness of expression.

The like may be said of that beauty of composition, arising from the artificial arrangement of words, which our author affects so much to admire; but which we have not modern metaphysics or ancient philology enough to taste. Propriety and precision are with us the two principal beauties in verbal composition; being perfectly satisfied if we can gradually comprehend a complex sentence by the time we come to the end of it, without requiring to have its meaning strike upon us all at once. In treating of the *material* part of language, as he calls vocal sound, this author follows servilely the track of the ancients, respecting *articulation*, *accent*, and *quantity*, without noticing any thing of what has been lately written on the subject. He makes respectful mention, indeed, of one Mr. Herries, a Scotchman, who has for some years past been obligingly assiduous in endeavouring to teach the English nation to speak their native tongue; for which, however, he hath sometimes met with the most ungrateful returns.\* We are sorry to be obliged to say, that almost every thing advanced in this part of the work, respecting the articulation and melody of the English language, is false and contemptible. It is, indeed, impossible for a man of the greatest learning and ingenuity to judge with propriety of the pronunciation and prosody of a language he cannot *speak*.

His

\* Having very narrowly escaped being tossed in a blanket at Oxford; notwithstanding he went thither with the recommendation of Bishop Lowth. The junior part of the University, however, entertained a very different opinion of this Orator's abilities; if, indeed, the bishop's recommendation was not obtained *speciali gratia*.

His observations on the principles of syntax, which next follow, are not liable to the same objection, but appear to us, though concise, unexceptionable. His observations on the melody of the Greek are, also, learned and ingenious; and, for ought any body can tell at this distance of time, as applicable as the problematical state of the sound of a dead language will admit.

In this volume, to a very high encomium on the Greek language is added an account of the Chinese, together with a view of the attempt at a philosophical language, by the famous Bishop Wilkins. A supplement is also annexed, containing three tracts; the first, on the general formation of the Greek language; the second, on its particular construction with regard to melody; and the third, on the arrangement of words in the Greek writers. We cannot help thinking that, in all these tracts, there is something too fantastic and visionary to be admitted merely on the strength of our author's argument.

In the third volume, which is more immediately before us, containing the fourth Book of Part II. our author treats particularly of *style*, the next step in the progress of language after the grammatical part is completed.

"By *style*, (says our author) I do not mean every combination of words expressing some sense; but I mean such a combination, as, in regard either of the words, or the composition of those words, or both, is some way different from ordinary discourse.\* It has a certain character by which we distinguish it, and denominate it the historical, the didactic, the poetic, the epistolary, and the like. Even dialogue writing, though it be in imitation of conversation, is nevertheless different from ordinary conversation upon the common affairs of life.†

"Style consists of two parts; the choice of words, and the composition of those words.‡ And, as the last of these two is of greatest

\* When the *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, in *Moliere*, Act 2. sc. 4 asks his master in philosophy, whether, when he calls to his maid---*Nicole*, *apportez moi mes pantoufles, et me donnez mon bonnet de nuit*, it be prose or verse? the philosopher answers that it is *prose*; he might have further added, that though it was *prose*, it was not *style*.

† Of this kind of style are the dialogues of Plato, and also the dialogue in our best comedies; which, though it be conversation, yet every reader of any taste will perceive it to be something above the style of ordinary conversation, as much as the tone and manner of the player who speaks it is above that of ordinary conversation, though at the same time not altogether different from it, if the player has a just sense of decorum, and the propriety of the part which he acts.

‡ *Omnis igitur oratio conficitur ex verbis; quorum primum nobis ratio simpliciter videnda est, deinde conjuncte. Nam est quidam ornatus orationis, qui ex singulis verbis est; alius, qui ex continuatis conjunctisque constat. De Oratore, lib. 3. cap. 37*

And, to the same purpose, the *Halicarnassian*, *ἅπαντα μετὰ εἰς δύο μέρη διαίρεται τὰ πρῶτα, εἰς τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων, ὅφ' ὧν δηλαῖται τὰ πρᾶγματα, καὶ εἰς τὴν συνθεσιν τῶν ἐλαττοῦν τῶν καὶ μείζονων μορίων.*

*De Thucyd. Judicium. p. 237. Edit. Hudson.*

greatest variety, and distinguishes most the several kinds of style from one another, we commonly, in English, denominate the whole from that part, calling style, in general, by the name of *composition*.

“ Words taken singly are to be considered with respect either to their sound or their sense. As to the sound, they are varied in several different ways that have been observed by grammarians; but, with respect to the sense, or meaning, they are only either proper or tropical.\*

“ As to the second part of style, or composition, it is more various; but all its variety may be reduced under three heads. *First*, the sound of words in composition; *secondly*, the different ways in which the composition may be varied by grammatical construction; and, *lastly*, the several changes which are made in the composition, by giving a different turn to the thought, and consequently to the expression. These last are called, by critics, *figures of the sense*; as the former are called *figures of construction*.

“ Of these materials all style is made; for it is of these materials, differently used, that the didactic and the historic style are composed; the rhetorical and the poetic, the sublime, the pathetic, the ethic, the familiar, the epistolary, the witty, the humorous, and whatever other difference of style can be imagined. All these may be called the *colours* of style; and of these I propose to treat, after having explained the materials above-mentioned, of which style is composed.”

This (says our author) is a short summary of the subject of the book. To specify the numerous parts, into which it is subdivided, would not only take up too much room, but would afford little information to our readers, as it would prevent us giving a satisfactory extract from any one. We shall content ourselves, therefore, with the selection of a passage or two on different topics, as a farther specimen of this learned writer's judgment and taste respecting literary composition.

On the three general characters of style he thus expatiates:

“ In the preceding chapters, I have treated of the various forms and figures that words assume, whether single or in composition. These may be said to be the materials of which style is made; and, according as these materials are used, style takes different *colours*, as I call them, by which it is denominated such or such a kind of style; simple, for example, or ornamented—historical, rhetorical, or didactic; and it is of these colours of style that I am now to treat.

VOL. IV.

P p

“ What

\* In this division of single words, I have followed the Halicarnassian in the passage above quoted, where he says, ἡ ἐκλογή των στοιχειωδων μοριων, ονοματικων λεγων και ρημ ατικων και συνδετικων, εις τε την κυριαν φρασιν διαιρεται, και εις την τροπικην. *Id.* Cicero in the passage above quoted, cap. 38. mentions two other kinds of words, viz. *Old*, or *Obsolete* words, and *new*, that is, words made for the occasion. But these are only subdivisions of the division which I have given; for all words, whether old or new, are either proper or tropical. And I think it is fitter to mention that distinction of words, when we come to speak of the particular styles in which they may be properly used.

“ What we call *style*, being, as I have said, something different from plain grammatical speech, and more or less ornamented, the first and most natural division of it is taken from the greater or less degree of ornament bestowed upon it. And, as every thing in which quantity is considered is least, or greatest, or middle and betwixt the two, so it is with style; that which is least ornamented we call the *Simple style*; that which is most we call the *High style*; and that which is betwixt the two, is the *Middle style*; and these make the three general colours, or characters, as they are commonly called, of style.

“ The first kind is so little ornamented, that it appears not to be ornamented at all, and to be no better than common speech; for it has no *ambitious* ornaments, as they may be called, nothing prominent, or, as it were, sticking out; and what Petronius Arbitrarius says of a good style, will, in a particular manner, apply to this, when it is brought to perfection—‘*naturali pulchritudine exurgit* \*.’ This is so true, that a man, not learned in the critical art, or who has not formed a taste by much reading and observation, will be apt to think, that all is nature in this style, and no art at all. But, when he comes to try to imitate it, he will find that what Horace says is true,

-----Sudat multum, frustra que laborat

Aufus idem,-----

“ The Halicarnassian tells us †, that all the historians of Greece, before Herodotus who first ornamented history, wrote in this style; all the ancient philosophers too of Greece, who wrote upon subjects of natural philosophy; and the whole Socratic school, Plato only excepted who first ornamented philosophy, as Herodotus had done history; the ancient orators too, as the Halicarnassian says, spoke and wrote in this character of style ‥; and the same, no doubt, was the style of the first orators of Rome, after speaking became an art in that city, which, as Cicero informs us, did not happen till about the time of Ennius the poet, who praises one M. Cornelius Cethegus as a good speaker §. In the more ancient times, both of Greece and Rome,

Cum neque musarum scopulos quisquam superarat,  
Nec dicti studiosus erat-----

as old Ennius says, there was no doubt a great deal of speaking, as it was in that way that all public affairs were conducted in both nations; but it was only in later times that it became an art; so that,  
till

\* *Satyr. in initio.*

† *Περὶ τῆς δεινότητος τῆς Δημοσθενέως*, cap. 7. et de Thucyd. cap. 23.

‡ Such were Hecateus, Hellanicus, and others, who wrote what the Halicarnassian calls *Genealogical and Topical Histories*. Josephus, in his first book against Apion, c. 22. has preserved to us some passages from Hecateus, by which the learned reader will judge of the simplicity of his style. And there is a fragment of Hellanicus preserved, but I cannot recollect in what author, which is still more simple.

‖ See Cicero, de Clar. orator. c. 7. where he gives us a history of the progress of eloquence in Greece.

§ Cicero, *ibid.* c. 15.



will then, the orators could not properly be said to speak in any *style*, but only to deliver their sentiments in a rude artless manner.

"This simple style was brought to perfection, as the Halicarnassian says \*, by Lyſias the Athenian orator; and, indeed, what remains of him well justifies the praise which this critic has bestowed upon him. In the narrative particularly he is admirable; and it is to that part of an oration that this style is most suitable. For if a narrative is much ornamented, it has not the appearance of truth, but of a tale, designed either to impose upon the hearer, or to make an ostentatious shew of the author's genius. Hence it comes, that the narrative of Homer is more credible than that of Virgil, not only because it is more circumstantial, which also gives a great air of truth to a story, but because it is less ornamented.

"Demosthenes, as he had all the great talents of an orator, so he possessed this faculty among others, of writing most simply, and without the least appearance of art, though he was master of every art belonging to the profession. Indeed, I was never thoroughly convinced of his being so perfect in the art, till I came to read the narratives of some of his orations in private causes, particularly one quoted by the Halicarnassian, from his oration against Conon, which is so much in the style of Lyſias, that, as this critic says, if it were not for the title and inscription, it would be impossible to say, whether it belonged to Lyſias or Demosthenes; for the words, as well as the composition, are all plain and simple, without trope or figure, or adscititious ornament of any kind. And it is full of the *τὸ ἡθικόν*, or *ethic*, which is the chief ornament of this kind of style, and is more persuasive, at least among the people, both in narrative and argument, than any thing else belonging to style, because it touches the heart more †.

"Among the most perfect models of this kind of style were the authors of the new comedy in Athens, particularly Menander. His comedies are now unfortunately lost; but in Terence we have excellent imitations of them, or rather translations; for the Romans, when they first began to write, stuck so close to the Greek originals, that they translated them. And Donatus, the commentator upon Terence, tells us, that Terence would have valued himself less upon writing a comedy of his own, than upon translating from the Greeks. The style of Terence, is, in good Latinity, called *purus sermo*. Thus Julius Cæsar, in his verses upon Terence ‡, calls him *puri sermonis amator*; and Terence himself, in the prologue to the *Heautontimorumenos*, calls the style of that comedy *pura oratio*. It is called, I think, with propriety enough, *pure*, as not being discoloured, or, as it were, *troubled* with tropes and figures, but altogether simple and of one colour. For though, in every good style, there should be one colour predominant, there is in other styles a mixture to a certain degree. For example, though the general co-

P p 2

lour

\* *Ubi supra.*

† Dionys. the Halicarnassian *περι τῆς Δημοσθενέως δεινότητος*, c. 12. & 13.

‡ See Suetonius's Life of Terence.

lour of the style of Homer be the high heroic, yet, in many passages, where the subject requires it, the style is perfectly simple, as simple as that of Terence's comedies. And it is a fault in Virgil's *Eneid*, that there is little or no variety of style, all of it having more or less of the heroic swell. In such works, a poet must know how to vary properly the colour of his style :

Descriptas fervare vices, operumque colores  
Cur ego, si nequeo ignoroque, poeta salutor ?

Whereas, in the comedy of Terence, the style is all of the same colour, that is, perfectly simple, without any tumor or swell ; or, if there be any thing of that kind upon any particular occasion, it is noted as something extraordinary. As when Chremes, in the *Hecautentimorumenos*, being extremely provoked against his son for his disorderly life, accosts him in this way :

— Non si ex capite sis meo  
Natus, item ut aiunt Minervam esse ex Jove, ea causa magis,  
Patiar, Clitipho, flagitiis tuis me infamem fieri ;

Act, v, sc, 4.

Which makes Horace say,

Interdum tamen et vocem comœdia tollit,  
Iratuque Chremes tumido delitigat ore.

“ To distinguish this style from the low and the vulgar, is a matter of pretty nice judgment ; for that is the extreme which it borders upon ; and we see from Terence's prologue to the *Phormio*, that his pieces were said, by his adversaries, to be written *tenui oratione et scriptura levi*, that is, in a style too simple, and too little raised. But not only the learned critic, but even a man of good natural taste, will perceive the difference. And, however easy it may seem to imitate such a style, any one who tries it will find, that it is true what Horace says,

— Sudet multum, frustra que laboret  
Ausus idem\*.

And, indeed, take the style of Terence altogether, the expression of characters and manners in it, as well as the elegance and wonderful simplicity, I do not know but it is more difficult to imitate than even the style of Homer.

“ The author, in English, that has excelled the most in this style is Dr Swift, in his *Gulliver's Travels* ; of which the narrative is wonderfully plain and simple, minute likewise, and circumstantial, so much, as to be disgusting to a reader without taste or judgment, and the character of an English sailor is finely kept up in it. In short, it has every virtue belonging to this style ; and I will venture to say, that those monstrous lies so narrated, have more the air of probability than many a true story unskilfully told. And, accordingly, I have been informed, that they imposed upon many when they were

\* The attentive reader will observe that this very sentiment is expressed almost *verbatim*, and the same verse quoted from Horace in the beginning of this very quotation. Similar instances of forgetfulness and repetition are to be met with in other parts of the work.

were first published. The voyage to Lilliput, in my judgment, is the finest of them all, especially in what relates to the politics of that kingdom, and the state of parties there. The debate in the King's council, concerning Gulliver, is a master-piece; and the original papers it contains, of which he says he was so lucky as to get copies, give it an air of probability that is really wonderful. When we add to all this, the hidden satire which it contains, and the grave ridicule that runs through the whole of it, the most exquisite of all ridicule, I think I do not go too far when I pronounce it the most perfect work of the kind, ancient or modern, that is to be found. For, as to Lucian's true history, which is the only ancient work of the kind that has come down to us, it has nothing to recommend it, except the imitation of the grave style of the ancient historians, such as Herodotus; but it wants the satire and exquisite ridicule that is to be found in the Dean's work.

[To be concluded in our next.]

---

*The Conduct of the Primitive Fathers, in the reception and transmission of Books ascribed to the Apostles and their Companions.*  
8vo. 1s. 6d. Bew.

The substance of this pamphlet is thrown into the form of *Letters*, concerning which the writer, in his preface, expresses himself as follows:

"I think there is nothing professedly written on this subject in our language; and the remarks I now send to you, would have admitted of a more advantageous form.

"But there is such a general and an avowed contempt for all such *dry* *useless* subjects, that the few following letters are scarce worth considering as an object of public attention."

It is somewhat singular, if the writer be sincerely of this opinion, respecting these letters, that he should trouble the public with them. But, whatever be the opinion of the writer, we are persuaded there are many readers, who do not think the subject of them so *dry* and *useless*, but that they will peruse them with more than ordinary satisfaction. The author is evidently a master of their subject; which he hath treated with ingenuousness and perspicuity; fairly stating the general objections that have been made to the authenticity of the scriptural books, and defending that of the received Canon with judgment and propriety.

The questions, proposed in the first letter, to which the subsequent letters are an answer, are couched in the following terms,

"Are not the early fathers our principal witnesses, that any care was taken by the first Christians, in the reception and transmission of books ascribed to the apostles, and their companions: and what integrity, care or prudence have they shewn themselves; judging of their conduct, from the proofs given of it, in the works under their names?"

"Are

“Are your witnesses, with all their affectation of simplicity, piety and goodness, free from the just imputation of fraud, in the forgery or interpolation of books under authoritative names? Were they not grossly credulous and ignorant in the ordinary transactions of their times? Do they not seem to have been without a wish and without abilities, to detect the more questionable relations given to them. And must they not have been particularly destitute either of opportunities, or circumspection, in tracing books under *Apostolic* names, to their authors; since they are asserted, to quote as *equally authoritative*, all Christian scriptures, subservient to *their* scheme of Christ's life and doctrine?”

“I do not wish to misrepresent the characters and conduct of men so long deemed the friends of virtue and religion. But whether the received scriptures of the New Testament, are the word of God, or the inventions of men,—in more pertinent terms, whether they are justly or falsely inscribed, is a question of much consequence with me. I am very desirous of embracing and obeying the truth. But I wish not my faith, concerning antient and important facts, to be built on bare probabilities.

“It is well known, that the early Heresiarchs, imposed on *their* deluded followers, many spurious histories of Christ, under the names of Bartholomew, Peter, Philip, and others—why may we not justly suspect, some presumptuous and artful *Catholics* of those days, desirous of passing their own gospel-histories under apostolic names, to have been *equally* successful in the *orthodox churches*? Were not the several histories of our religion originally published *without names*, and do we not entirely trust for their names, to weak, incautious or piously fraudulent men?”

To these queries the writer thus replies in his second epistle.

“Your suggestions against the characters of the earliest and purest fathers, are not even applicable to the faults and follies of the worst and latest in the papal times. The several charges of pious *fraud* and *forgery* against the fathers of the *two first centuries* (with whom the *canon* is principally concerned) are particularly destitute of proof. And the few instances of *inattentive confidence* to be found in their works, however disingenuously exaggerated, are impotently objected to the *authority* of the New Testament.

“You need not doubt the credibility of the testimonies which I have sent to you. The principal works from which they are taken, are generally, and on enquiry you will find *justly* deemed genuine. These works indeed, like most other ancient histories, partake of the erroneous doctrines of the times in which they were written, philosophical and religious. But their authors were men of integrity, competent judges, and singularly cautious in the reception and transmission of books ascribed to the apostles.

“Indeed I think that if you attentively read the apocryphal pieces, or fragments of the early ages; the *received* books of the New Testament; and a few of the first ecclesiastical histories; you will be well satisfied that the primitive fathers have acted (in the reception of

of books) with all the judgment and care, which the importance of the case required.

“ Of the many rejected gospels, acts, traditions, preachings, &c. assuming *sacred* names, the greatest part are altogether lost. And of the several pieces or fragments which remain from other early productions, under similar titles—there is scarcely a sentence free from blasphemy, falsehood, or some ridiculous tale, unworthy of any wise and good man, much more of an apostle. They were too despicable to deserve attention, even in the times said to have been most favourable to such impostures. They need only be read to be rejected.

“ Turn to the received books of the New Testament. You will find the internal evidence so much in their favour, you may perhaps be content to say with Salvianus, *Dei sermo ipse sibi testis est*. There is a dignity, purity, and affectionate warmth in the doctrines, precepts and exhortations of those sacred books, unequalled by any merely human productions, worthy of their assumed authors, adapted to our nature, and equal to our necessities. There are moreover no anachronisms in them; no manifest errors; nothing contrary to the faith of history: and they have all the internal evidence of being the productions of those times in which they are said to have been written, that any ancient books can have.

“ Is not this selection of scriptures, which the early fathers have made from the numerous productions of their times, a good proof at least of their judgment and care. But if you are not wholly satisfied with *internal* evidence, you will proceed to *external* testimony—to the testimony of those writers, who lived nearest the times when these books are supposed to have been written, and who with the best opportunities of knowing the truth, have, as far as we can discover, faithfully declared it.

The display of this *external* testimony in favour of the primitive fathers is the subject of the remaining letters, the last of which he closes thus:

“ We have passed by several excellent observations in our way, especially in Eusebius, tending to evince the great care and circumspection of the fathers. But those we have produced, it is hoped, are sufficient.

“ I will therefore conclude, that as the early fathers were honest men, who had good opportunities of discovering the original of the several books, were much concerned to enquire, and appear to have made suitable enquiry; that as their testimony was received as of undoubted authority by the succeeding fathers, and as far as appears their principal works are genuine; there is no reason to doubt of the validity of their evidence—whatever books they deemed genuine, ought so to be deemed by us, if the internal testimony of the books themselves do not forbid it; and whatever books they rejected, ought to be rejected by us, notwithstanding the venerable names which they assumed, or their confident pretensions to a divine original.”

We are not unawares, that it may be asked the *London Reviewers*, after what they have lately advanced respecting the moral evidence

dence for the authenticity of the scriptures, whether they themselves do not think the subject of the above letters also dry and *useless*. Our readers, however, are mistaken if they apprehend that we think the same kind and degree of influence necessary to induce the same kind and degree of belief in different minds. Men of different dispositions, intellects and degrees of knowledge require very different kinds and degrees of evidence to induce the same mode and degree of belief. The ignorant and unsuspecting are ready to believe any thing that appears in print; while the knowing and suspicious are as apt to doubt every thing unless supported by evidence; nay some are so sceptical as to doubt, and even so dogmatical as to deny, almost every thing that will not admit of mathematical demonstration. It were, therefore, as absurd to deny the utility of the species of evidence which is adapted to influence the one, because it has no influence on the other; as it would be to insist that mathematical demonstration is not more convincing than the strongest moral evidence.

W.

---

*The Metamorphoses, a comic Opera. In Two Acts. As it is performed at the Theatre-Royal in the Hay-market. 8vo: 1s. Lowndes.*

One of those musical productions, that serve to shew to what vile uses the sublime arts of music and poetry may be degraded, when prostituted to the purposes of pecuniary emolument, and the gratification of the *Taste*, as it is called of the *Town*.—"Like lips like lettuces." To the ears of *Midas* the roaring of *Pan* appeared preferable to the song of *Apollo*.

\* \*

---

*An Inquiry into the powers of Ecclesiastics, on the principles of Scripture and Reason. 8vo. 4s. Murray.*

This writer, admitting that the arrogance and presumption of Ecclesiastics hath brought not only the ministerial character, but the Christian religion itself into disgrace, endeavours to restore the credit of the sacred function, by ascertaining its privileges and pointing out its utility. Among other expedients, tending to this purpose, he hints at the propriety of Christian ministers being chosen by the people, like British Members of Parliament.—Heaven forefend! We have enough of *political* electioneering, God forbid we should have a general election of Christian ministers. The cabals at the petty elections for parish Lecturers, sufficiently indicate the impropriety of *religious* electioneering.

\* \* \*

Familiar



*Familiar Dialogues between Americanus and Britannicus. By John Martin. 8vo. 1s. Wilkie.*

If brother Martin and brother Scrub, in imitation of their namesakes in the play, had wisely determined to hold their tongues and say nothing till there should be a peace, neither Great Britain nor America would have suffered much by their silence. Their arguments, however, are not the weakest nor their language the worst, that have been made use of in the many altercations, fictitious and real, lately held on the subject.

\* \*

*Justification de la Resistance des Colonies Americaines. 8vo. 1s. Boiquier.*

As the liberty of the press is the favourite object of a Briton, who pleads his claim to it as his birth-right, he may be indulged with some propriety to carry it occasionally to the verge of licentiousness; but what pretensions any refugee Frenchman can have to stand up in justification of English rebellion, we cannot devise. On the contrary we think he ought to receive the castigation due to his impertinence and be banished back again to his own country.

\* \*

*Discourses on various Subjects. By William Samuel Powel, D. D. late Archdeacon of Colechester, and Master of St. John's College, Cambridge. Published by Thomas Balguy, D. D. 8vo. 5s. L. Davis.*

The orthodox author of these Discourses made himself long since many enemies, among the party of the petitioners against subscriptions, by the sermon he preached, about twenty years ago, before the University of Cambridge, and published soon after, under the title of 'A Defence of the Subscriptions required in the Church of England.' This Sermon decried by some as much as it was commended by others, is here printed, with sixteen others; to which are added three charges and an academical thesis in Latin. The subject of most of the sermons is the evidence of different kinds in favour of Christianity. There are some, indeed, on other subjects, particularly one on the Nature and extent of Divine inspiration; from which we shall select the following specimen of the preacher's style, and mode of thinking on this much controverted topic.

"Concerning the influence of God's spirit men have fallen into two mistakes: which, though founded on the same false principle, are yet opposite to each other; and, though opposite, are equally dangerous: the one to religion, the other to morals. Some men, virtuous in their conduct, and serious in their faith, neither

VOL. IV.

Q 9

perceiving

perceiving the operation of the spirit within themselves, nor hearing that others, of a sober and rational piety, pretend to such sensations, impute this whole notion to enthusiasm, and suppose that the promises of the scripture are either misunderstood, or extend not to these times. Others, having a temper more affected by religious subjects, and, being fully convinced that good Christians, in all ages, may expect the divine assistance, easily fancy that they perceive it, and are very apt to mistake the suggestions of a warm imagination for the dictates of the Holy Spirit. The two errors seem to be derived from this one principle, that, whenever our minds are influenced, we cannot be ignorant by whom, and in what manner, they are influenced; a principle contradictory to constant experience. We are perpetually conscious of changes in our sentiments and inclinations, without knowing or attending to the causes of the changes. We even proceed to actions, the motives to which escape observation. When the origin of any opinion is within our own minds, we frequently do not remark it. When it is without them, we are as frequently unable to discover it. The dispositions of those a man converses with, the studies he is engaged in, the amusements he follows, imperceptibly alter his sentiments upon subjects, with which they seem to have little connexion. The state of his body, every external accident, even the weather, affects his mind more than he can believe, till repeated experience has convinced him. If all these trifles can influence us, and if the influence of causes so obvious is often unnoticed; can it be a question, Whether we may not be secretly guided by an omnipotent and spiritual director? It is equally irrational to conclude, either because we are not sensible of his assistance, that none is given, or because we rely on God's promises, that the assistance given must necessarily be perceived."

The subject of our author's three *Charges* are 1st. On Religious Controversy. 2d. The Reward of Merit in the Clergy. 3d. The Use and Abuse of Reason in matters of Religion.

---

*The Guide to Domestic Happiness. In a Series of Letters.*  
 "This is the way, walk ye in it." 8vo.. 1s. Buckland.

A pious and pathetic exhortation, addressed to a husband and wife in a middle station of life, on the respective duties of their calling and situation. But we cannot give a more commendatory account of these moral and religious epistles than is given, by the modest and sensible author, in his preface.

"A sincere desire, says he, of promoting the happiness and interests of society, once induced me to publish three of the following Letters. For the same purpose they are, with some corrections and the addition of a fourth, again submitted to the inspection and candor of the Public.

"If it should be asked what reference the subsequent letters have to the public welfare at large? the author can give no other reason than that he thinks there is an inseparable, or at least a more intimate

mate connection between domestic happiness and the interests of society than is generally imagined. It is not perhaps easy to conceive how a bad *Husband* can be a good *Father*, a good *Master*, or a worthy member of society: 'for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God,' or be a competent judge of what is necessary for the public welfare.

"The old proverb, 'let every man look at home,' is applicable to our present purpose: here it is that reformation is first wanted. Every family may be considered as a distinct society connected with the body politic; and if these societies are immoral, degenerate, or corrupt, such also must be the body. That there is much need both of public and domestic reformation, is a truth too obvious to be denied; but whether these letters are calculated to promote it, must be left to the decision of better judges than myself.

"Different men, it is certain, will judge differently; and accordingly will either censure or approve. In this they have a right to be indulged: the right of private judgment must be held inviolate: we cannot even wish to infringe on that liberty of thinking, which is the inalienable and indefeasible right of every man, and from which none should stand excluded. And yet, on recollection, it is perhaps possible to mention instances where men, if they have not forfeited their right of thinking for themselves, have forfeited their right of censuring or of judging others. For instance: Men may be so much addicted to sin, as to be insensible of guilt; for sin is both of a defiling and hardening nature: an atrocious crime is first committed with some sensations of remorse, then with some degree of boldness, and repeated afterwards perhaps with pleasure. To speak in scripture language, the conscience is as if 'seared with a hot iron;' they are 'past feeling, having given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness,' and are therefore improper judges of either the beauty of *virtue* or the deformity of vice. In such a case, the *Voluptuary* will plead for his pleasures, the *Drunkard* for his drink, and the *Adulterer* \* for his lust.

"From such I would turn, therefore, and appeal for the propriety of my remarks to the more dispassionate and wise. The different subjects mentioned in the following sheets, are supposed to be treated in a manner perfectly consistent with the oracles of God: if so, the author has nothing to fear, if otherwise, he may perhaps have the pleasure to see an exhibition of his errors, and the gratitude to thank the hand by which it may be given."

The title page of this interesting little performance is decorated with an elegant frontispiece designed and engraved by Taylor.

Q q 2

Observations

\* While the last sheet of the present work was at press, I had some thoughts of adding as a kind of seasonable appendage, a short dissertation on the practice and sin of adultery. But these thoughts were happily superseded on being informed by the blue cover of a periodical work that the subject was not only anticipated, but in great forwardness for publication by a much abler hand. I can with great truth assure the very sensible author, that it affords me uncommon pleasure to find he has been led to treat on a subject that is but little regarded, but which is of the last importance.

*Observations on Dr. Price's Theory and Principles of Civil Liberty and Government, &c.* 8vo. 2s. Doddsley.

These observations are imputed to Henry Goodriche, Esq; and contain a liberal and dispassionate discussion of some of Dr. Price's principles, particularly that respecting the incapacity of the people to delegate their power to government. "I am of opinion, says he, that civil government can be considered in no other light than as a TRUST limited in its nature, by the purposes of the civil union, committed to a certain person or persons by the society for the common benefit; in so much that governors possess no power beyond the above limits, and that the only just foundation of all civil authority is the *consent* of the community."—There appears to us, however, something very vague and indeterminate in this opinion. Granting that government is a *trust* committed to the hands of a few for the *common benefit* of all; it is rather the *common benefit* of the community which is the foundation of all civil authority, than the *common consent* of the community. What if the collective body or the majority of a people should happen to be so infatuated, (as is often the case) not to approve of the means that tend to their common benefit; what if they should take it into their heads to be ungovernable, or not to be governed at all; would the *trustees* for the time being, possess no lawful authority to oppose the frenzy, and check the madness of the licentious multitude?—Would not the rectitude, the prudence of the measures they might take for the *common benefit* of the whole community, be as just a foundation for civil authority to interpose and even by force preserve such a people from destruction, as would be the *consent* of such a people to warrant their governors to abandon them to anarchy and confusion?—The mistake seems to lie in imputing the *civil union* to a mere *voluntary*, or rather *capricious* act, which the community might or might not have entered into, and may or may not dissolve, *ad libitum*. But this is not the case; the origin of civil society is founded on the necessities of human nature, they are compelled to unite for their common good, and it is on the *common good*, and not merely on the *common consent*, of every civil society, that all civil authority is founded.

K.

---

*A New System, or an Analysis of ancient Mythology: Wherein an Attempt is made to divest Tradition of Fable, and to reduce Truth to its original Purity.* By Jacob Bryant, formerly of King's College, Cambridge, and Secretary to his Grace the late Duke of Marlborough. Vol. III. 4to 11. 2s. boards. Payne.

The third volume of a most elaborate and profound investigation of the Heathen Mythology; the two first volumes of which were published before the commencement of the *London Review*. In this work is given an history of the Babylonians, Chaldeans, Egyptians, Canaanites, Helladians, Ionians, Laleges, Dorians, Pelasgi; also of the Scythæ, Indoscythæ, Ethiopians, and Phenicians: containing

aa

an account of the principal events in the first ages of the world, from the deluge to the dispersion at Babel: also of the various migrations which ensued, and the settlements made afterwards in different parts; circumstances of great consequence, which were subsequent to the gentile history of Moses.

“ P-x on't,” quoth Time to Thomas Hearne,  
“ Whatever I forget you learn.”

A distich this, which may with still more propriety be applied to Mr. Bryant, than even to that laborious antiquary on whom it was made. It is, indeed, with admiration and astonishment we have perused this laborious and ingenious enquiry into the history and fables of the most remote antiquity: nor do we more admire the sagacity with which his researches appear to have been conducted, than we are struck with surprize at the novelty and lustre of those rays of elucidation, by which he hath found means to throw a clear and powerful light on some of the darkest passages of the most ancient history. As enquiries of this nature, however, afford little entertainment to the generality of readers, we forbear extract, and refer the curious to the work itself; which will amply gratify the most erudite curiosity.

\* \* \*

---

*Observations preparatory to the Use of Dr. Myersbach's Medicines.*  
By J. C. Lettsom, M.D. F.R.S. and S.A. Member of the  
College of Physicians, and Physician to the general Dispensary in London.  
The second Edition, considerably enlarged, 8vo. 1s. 6d. Dilly.

We are glad to see the name of the author subscribed to these observations, for the reasons we gave, in our account of the first edition of this pamphlet, respecting *anonymous* publications, especially such as are calculated to correct ignorance or detect imposture. In the present impression many additional cases are inserted that have since come under the author's immediate cognizance; and which afford as many lamentable proofs of the indiscriminate use of remedies in the hands of the daring and ignorant.

We are told also in an advertisement prefixed to this edition, that “ the author has had no reason to alter his sentiments respecting the impositions practised by Dr. Myersbach, and those connected with him; on the contrary, he is confirmed in the opinions he first suggested, by the testimony of Dr. Myersbach's apothecary, who has communicated much more than he chooses at present to repeat, as the whole imposture, to give it the mildest epithet, will soon appear in a court of justice; where he doubts not but the astonishment of the public will be equalled only by their indignation for the insults and injuries practised upon the weak and credulous part of the community.

We



We rejoice to hear there is some prospect of bringing any of those pests to society, medical empirics, to legal punishment; and cannot help entertaining the highest regard for those who have sense and spirit enough, to begin so salutary a prosecution. As health also is the most valuable blessing in life, and yet the most sensible when they are sick, are sometimes so infatuated as to trifle with the loss of it, we shall make a short extract from our author's introduction, which may not be thrown away upon any of our readers.

"Deceptions, similar in cause and effect, have prevailed over the understandings of men in all ages, and in every department of life; marvellous and improbable stories, if once believed, are always admired and propagated; and thus artful men have found dupes in all ages and professions, the mind being as liable to admit poison as the body; and before the injuries of one species of deception have opened the eyes of the public, another starts up, and for a certain space of time equally detains its votaries in bondage. Strong indeed must be that bias, which leads a man to apply to a stranger, and repose in his hands the dearest of blessings; and callous must be the heart of him, who, ignorant of medicine, trifles with the pains, the miseries, and the lives of his fellow-creatures, for the sake of gratifying a mercenary disposition.

"I am sensible it may be said, that many a mountebank and water-conjurer, driven to seek a livelihood by poverty and distress, hath assumed a profession, for the sake of present bread, which they at first little imagined could have gained so many votaries, and consequently victims to their ignorance. I have seen the rise and progress of several such pretenders; and could relate many incidents and ingenious methods of deception, were not health and life too serious for diversion, and mankind too ready to improve in deceit, by adding to their own, that of others. It is no crime to have been poor; but whether poison be retailed, or sold by wholesale, the heart of the vender is equally criminal.

"One would be apt to imagine, after so many deceptions which men have been led into, that in so important a concern as health, they would seriously consider, that though a quack-medicine may sometimes cure, it more frequently injures the constitution through life, and impairs, not unfrequently, the vigor and health of succeeding generations. Mistakes in ordinary matters may be remedied; but a body ruined by injurious treatment, is a monument of folly, whose inscription the infatuated object painfully pauses over as long as he lives. Such instances have so often occurred to me, that I think it my duty to expose to the public, some of the practices which have lately deluded a great part of this city; the effects of which I find daily more injurious to the people, having, in my own practice, lately met with many persons, whose affecting treatment has been such, as demands the tear of humanity, and that sympathy, which the distress of our fellow-creatures excites, even when it arises from their own imprudence and misconduct."

In taking leave of this pamphlet, we must again repeat that we cannot but highly applaud the sensible, humane and spirited conduct of Dr. Lettsom in detecting, and publickly standing forth in opposition to so execrable an impostor.

---

*An Answer to a Pamphlet written by Doctor Lettsom, entitled Observations preparatory to the use of Doctor Mayerbach's Medicines.* 8vo. 1s. Almon.

“ And if a man did need a poison now,—  
“ Here lives a caitiff wretch would sell it him.”

Nay this more wretched grub would, if required, maintain the poison to be a wholesome, salutary, drug. We blush to think that there is among our countrymen to be found a single individual, capable of holding a pen, so depraved and abandoned as to become a venal advocate for such a daring impostor! This scribbler, indeed, pretends, that he is a volunteer in the cause.

“ It may be objected, says he, that it is very extraordinary a person unknown to Dr. Mayerbach should take so much pains in collecting of cases, and stepping forward in a transaction in which he is no way interested.

“ The answer is, that it was from a thorough conviction of Dr. Mayerbach's being what he really professes, a doctor of the first magnitude. That conviction, as was mentioned before, arose from ocular and auricular assurance of his skill. We beheld the wanton attack upon one, whom we look upon as a great public blessing, with an honest indignation. We communicated our sentiments to Mr. Willan, and 'tis to his interposition that Dr. Lettsom and the public are troubled with this trifle in Dr. Mayerbach's favour. Were it ten times more interesting and forcible than it is, it would, we are conscious, be far short of the doctor's desert.”

We can take upon us, however, to assure the public, that this answerer was employed by Mayerbach himself; to declare his thorough conviction that his employer is, as he modestly professes himself, a *doctor of the first magnitude*. And yet this hireling has the impudence to talk of *honest indignation*.----Who Mr. Willan is, we know not. They say, he is a man of worth and character. If so, we are sorry, he is so weak as to have, in this case forfeited all pretensions to common discretion. What the answerer means, by styling what he calls his *trifle, forcible as it is*, we know not, but we must with honest indignation declare, that trifling as it is, it is still too weak and contemptible a production, even for so confessed a trifle.--A trifle, truly! Ought the justification of an eventual murderer to be a trifle? a Myerbach, like a Wesley, indeed, may take upon him to trifle with the lives of his fellow creatures; but we are conscious also what would “ be far short of the doctor's desert.”

*The Harmony of Truth, &c.* 8vo. 1s. Law.

As this author wishes to be upon good terms with the *London Reviewers*, it shall be his fault, not ours, if he is not so. We have by no means any intention, as he insinuates, to depress him; altho not for the reason he gives, that we cannot do it, "because his knowledge is not his own." On the contrary, we think he might the sooner be depressed because he appears to have so little knowledge of his own. For that the abundance of divine knowledge, which he declares himself possessed of by a direct communication from the Almighty, is not his own, we admit: indeed we doubt whether he knows whether he be possessed of it or not. He is in the right in not considering us as opponents in the cause he has undertaken; and yet we do by no means approve of his ostentatious pretensions to the immediate inspiration and direction of the Deity. "Let no man," says he, "envy me in this matter; for knowledge is a dangerous talent, of the proper use of which I have a great account to give." Indeed we do not in the least envy this writer's knowledge, even though he so expressly tells us he has received it from above; we cannot conceive, however, how the greatest portion of such knowledge should be a dangerous talent. Ignorance indeed hath been called the curse of God, and is well known to be sufficiently dangerous; for nothing is more natural than for it to mistake itself for supernatural knowledge.

W.

---

*The Reformation of School-masters, Academy-keepers, Surgeons, Apothecaries, Physicians, Lawyers, Divines, Farmers, Irish White-boys and Rioters. Founded on evident Principles and a long Series of Observations: Addressed to the King and both Houses of Parliament, that British Subjects may be no longer imposed on by scheming Pretenders.*

What an Herculean labour hath this general reformer here projected! To clear the world, at least the British world, of imposition and impostors! Who, alas! will undertake even to clear the Augean stable only of this Metropolis!—What a pity that it is impossible to get so excellent a design put into execution!—The Critics, indeed, have said it is with a bad grace that so ungrammatical a writer should inveigh against the ignorance of those literary *swindlers* our common schoolmasters; but who, pray, hath so much right to charge them with imposture as those on whom they have practised their knavery. Doubtless our Reformer has been at the Grammar school; and, if the pedagogue his master, did not teach him Grammar, he hath undoubtedly the more right to complain:

\*\*\*

*The*

*New Brooms. A Prelude, as it was performed at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane. By G. Colman. 8vo. 1s.\* Becket.*

It has been shrewdly observed, by some philosopher or other, that, as there is no created Being in the Universe but what is good for something, every man living must possess talents, which properly directed might turn to good account. It is the want of this proper direction that makes some men run their heads against a pulpit, who might have made a figure in following the plough; and others undertake to manage a theatre, whom nature hath better qualified for sweeping the stage. Happy is it for the individual, who, like the author of *New Brooms*, discovers, before it be too late, what he is good for, and applies to it accordingly. It is an apparent degradation, to be sure, to descend from wielding the sceptre of managerial dignity to take up the broom of the sweeper; but, if the stage maxim be true, that the honour lies not in the part acted, but, in acting well the part, there is no doubt but Mr. Colman will soon gain more credit in his new employment of stage-sweeper and scene-shifter at Drury-lane Theatre, under the management of Mr. Sheridan, than he obtained at Covent-Garden during the whole time he was manager of that theatre.

\* \* \*

\* Afterwards lowered to six-pence, Mr. Becket modestly apologizing to the public, and confessing it is worth no more.

---

*The Temple of Mammon. 4to. 1s. Davies.*

We apprehend this description of the *Temple of Mammon*, will not procure its author a niche in the *Temple of Fame*, so beautifully described by Mr. Pope; whom he appears to have had in view, and was ambitious to follow: but he has not done it, by any means, *passibus æquis*.

\* \* \*

---

*A Collection of Cases of Privilege of Parliament, from the earliest Records to the Year 1628. 4to. 6s. Dodley.*

Extracted with apparent fidelity from the Parliamentary Records, by Mr Hatsell, clerk of the House of Commons.

\* \* \*

---

*Some Memoirs of the Life and Works of George Edwards, Fellow of the Royal and Antiquarian Societies. 4to. 4s. sewed. Robson.*

There appears to have been so little remarkable in the events of Mr Edwards's life, that his biographer has given us little more than a general history of his works, the merit of which is well known to all who are conversant in subjects of natural history.—Descriptions and prints of several of these subjects are added to these memoirs.

\* \* \*

*Every Woman her own Physician: Or the Lady's Medical Assistant. Containing the History and Cure of the various Diseases incident to Women and Children. By A. Hume, M. D. 12mo. 2s. Richardson and Urquhart.*

We would advise Dr. Hume, to compile next a pamphlet entitled "Every child its own Physician." What a pity the women and children are not admitted members, or at least licentiates, of the College of Physicians! What a pretty set of petticoated doctors we should have! Doctor Hume would make them as wise as himself presently.

\* \* \*

*Richardsoniana, or Occasional Reflections on the Moral Nature of Man, suggested by various Authors, Ancient and Modern, and exemplified from those Authors; with several Anecdotes interspersed. By the late Jonathan Richardson, jun. Esq; 8vo. 3s. Doddsley.*

A Miscellany of trite tales and old woman's stories that have been too often retailed by word of mouth to require or deserve being printed.

\* \* \*

*Memoirs of the Life of Miss Sophy Sternheim. Translated from the German of the celebrated Mr Weiland, by Edward Harwood D. D. 2 vols. 12mo. 5s. Becket.*

\* \* \*

There is considerable merit in this performance; a translation of which, by the late Mr. Collier, was, if we mistake not, published some time ago for Doddsley. We have not that version at hand to compare it with the present; it must have been but indifferent, however, if it made the present necessary. We think it a pity also that the respectable and reverend Dr. Harwood should not be more characteristically employed than in translating novels.

\* \* \*

*Original Letters, Dramatic Pieces and Poems. By Benjamin Victor. 8vo. 3vols. 1l. 1s. Becket.*

That these Letters, &c. of Mr Victor's should be *original*, is no wonder; the author himself being an *original*: but, though we cannot very highly commend this author as a writer, we think him so deserving a man that we do heartily recommend his book to public encouragement: not that it will be found destitute of entertainment to such as are not too critical to be easily pleased.

*Contemplation,*



*Contemplation, a Poetical Essay, on the Works of the Creation.*  
By the Reverend Richard Fayerman, M. A. Rector of Oby in  
Norfolk, and Chaplain to the Right Honourable the Earl of Eute.  
4to. 2s. Chase of Norwich.

We are sorry, for particular reasons, which will suggest themselves to the author, that we can say nothing in favour of this composition, except that the moral design of it is commendable, and that the very modest writer seems to be as sensible of its poetical demerit as we are, ourselves.

\* \* \*

*Sylvæ; or, a Collection of Poems on several Occasions.* By a young Gentleman of Chichester. 8vo. 2s. 6d. Hawes.

The nonage of this author may be supposed to plead exemption from criticism; but youth is the season for poetry, though poetry be not necessarily attendant on youth.—If our young gentleman rhimes no better next year, we would have him bid adieu to the muses, in the words of one of his town's-men,

Ye muses, adieu, for, no, ne'er will your bard  
Solicit your favours, your hearts are so hard,  
While Chichester Church stands in Chichester Church-yard.

\* \* \*

*Coryat's Crudities; re-printed from the Edition of 1611. To which are now added, his Letters from India, &c. Extracts relating to him, from various Authors: being a more particular Account of his Travels (mostly on foot) in different Parts of the Globe, than any hitherto published. With Copper-plates.* 8vo. 3 vols. 15s. Cater.

One would imagine the disgust, which should naturally be excited in the public by the crudities of our present grubs, might have deterred our editor from raking into the ashes of the dead to pick up the still more distasteful remains of the indigestion of their predecessors. For our own part, we cannot conceive to what kind of readers the stale remarks and low bombast of this pedestrian itinerant can afford either information or entertainment.

\* \* \*

*Medical and Philosophical Commentaries, by a Society of Physicians at Edinburgh.* No. 13. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Murray.

An occasional publication under the direction of the learned and ingenious Dr. Duncan, consisting of extracts from the Philosophical Transactions, Memoirs of Foreign Academies, and communications from private correspondents.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE LONDON REVIEWERS.

GENTLEMEN,

By giving the following remarks a place among the letters of your correspondents, you will oblige a constant reader.

South Molton,  
Sept. 20, 1776.

Yours,

S. B—k\*.

*Remarks on Dr. Kenrick's Observations on Seame Jenyns's View of the internal Evidence of the Christian Religion.*

These observations bear the very image of the author in lines so strongly marked, that it requires no great degree of penetration to discover him without the *supercription*. They are exceedingly shrewd and acute; and on the whole a remarkable production, considering the great haste with which it must have been penned. The author hath very keen intuitive powers, which, kept in constant exercise, give him an almost immediate access to the closest coverts of an argument. He pursues sophistry through every labyrinth, and detects imposture in her darkest retreats. As he hath shrewdness to baffle, so hath he wit to entertain. He quickly perceives the ridicule of false reasoning, as well as the error of it; and can either be *gay* or *grave*, *lively* or *severe* as the different views of the argument require.

This reply to Mr. Jenyns's celebrated pamphlet, contains sufficient evidence of the truth of these remarks on the talents of our author. And yet I must honestly confess, that I cannot perceive for what purpose they were employed in the present work—unless to serve the cause of *infidelity*.

It is not for me to pronounce that to have been Dr. Kenrick's leading design:—nor, indeed, would I indulge the suspicion of it, if appearances were not strongly against him.

In a very genteel address to Mr. Jenyns, our author professeth his belief in Christianity, so far as to wish that *he* who would not presume to put himself off on the world under a higher or a better character, than that of an *almost* Christian, might “thro superior influence” become a christian altogether. But how is this *superior influence* to be acquired? How may it be distinguished from the common feelings of the human heart when it is acquired? What must a man do before he hath acquired it? Must he believe it attainable? What grounds hath he for such a belief?

If it is said, that his grounds for the hope of such a supernatural blessing be in the repeated and explicit promises of Scripture;—it may next be asked, “on what footing we may credit the truth of those promises?” Thus the man is driven to and fro—from Scrip-  
ture

\* If we are not mistaken, the Rev. Mr. Badcock, of Barnstable, one of the learned and ingenious contributors to the Theological Repository.

ture to grace, and from grace back again to Scripture, without any firm foundation for the sole of his foot either in the one or the other.

Dr. Kenrick's attempt in the present work is to invalidate the force of all reasonings in defence of the doctrines of Christianity; and to bring into discredit those external and internal evidences which have been generally produced and argued on in proof of its divine original by all believers in revelation—some wild enthusiasts excepted.

It is impossible for me to rank Dr. Kenrick, with all his wit and sagacity about him, in the class of the latter; and yet, if we *must* think him in earnest in his professions, he places his belief in Christianity on the visionary footing of a mystic and a methodist.

Surely it is at least astonishing that the man who wishes for, and with the acutest eye in the world investigates the grounds and reasons of every proposition in natural science, should sit down content with a system of theology which hath no evidence at all;—should all at once passively resign his feelings as a man, and his judgment as a philosopher, to what not only *wants* proofs of divinity, but what *positively* counteracts all human credibility, and opposes the clearest deductions of reason and common sense.

But supernatural grace, we are told, supplies the want of natural evidence; changeth the very current of the mind the moment it comes under the influence of mystery: puts a force upon its powers to twist them into faith: and, in fact, vacates the first inspiration of the spirit to make room for a second: or rather sets up in the breast of the Christian two distinct and opposite standards of truth and error,—one for nature, the other for religion—one for this world, and another for the next. Thus the man is absolutely divided against himself. His rational and spiritual principles cannot blend in a uniform harmonious progression from things intuitively certain, to things necessary to be proved. They act their antipathies on one another at first; and the enmity encreaseth in direct proportion with the increase of natural wisdom and spiritual illumination.

Who but a madman can believe that reason and religion are thus meant to play at bo-peep with each other?—Dodwell was as far as most from madness, when he professed to believe it in his 'Christianity not founded on Argument.' He said 'it was founded on grace—on some divine impulse on the mind, quite independent on, and absolutely unconnected with the common principles of human nature.

But *his* work was indeed 'a mere controversial bubble, blown up to amuse well-meaning Christians, in order to impose on their credulity, and raise a sneer at the expence of their simplicity and sincerity.'

Poor Mr. Seagrave, a methodist parson, was charmed with the book. It was a precious morsel for the meek and humble lambs of the tabernacle, who were always frightened at the sound of reason, and thought it of no use for the soul; though the body might thrive the better for it;—and in that case, with all their solemn parade of self-annihilation, they were as ready to set their carnal reason to work, and make as good a use of it as the unenlightened sinners of the world.

Enthusiasm certainly is not founded on argument. This the good man had sense enough to perceive, and on that footing was  
heartily

heartily glad to see Christianity stripped of its rational evidence, that his fanaticism might stand on an equal footing with it, and have as fair a chance of gaining credit in the world. Our tabernacle-brother was perfectly grave and in earnest—poor honest soul! But Dodwell was laughing all the while, and enjoyed the fun of taking in a saint, to join with him in doing the work of a sinner.

For the methodist, in the simplicity of his heart, vindicated Dodwell against the attacks of Doddridge and others; who, he imagined, had a very bad design in making reason join issue with revelation. The truth of the matter was as Bishop Warburton hath represented it in his *Doctrine of Grace*.

The injudicious concessions and announced principles of some zealous friends of revelation, gave this sly infidel a fine handle to misrepresent the general evidence of Christianity, and under pretensions of fixing it on a more certain foundation, removed it from its best, and indeed only support; and placed it where no man of sense saw it could stand.

To recur to a mystery in an affair where reason is baffled, and all enquiry non-plus'd; and to bring no proof of its truth but a passive acquiescence of the mind, arising from some unknown and unaccountable impulse in contradiction to our native feelings, is certainly the most commodious way of silencing doubts and barring objections. It is cutting the gordian knot, to be sure; or in other words, it is consecrating a refuge for nonsense to keep it out of harm's way, when closely pursued by an enemy. And can *such* a mind as that which Heaven, from the first rays of its intelligence, hath formed for Dr. Kenrick, be satisfied to sit down with his eyes closed and his arms folded, to be carried to heaven (I speak not prophanely) the Lord knows how?

In reasoning in this manner, I have supposed Dr. Kenrick to be in earnest when he says, *page 212—217*, “Depended its sacred mysteries on the force of *reason*, what can be more rationally advanced in defence of the incarnation of Jesus, than of the incarnation of Vishnou? Depended they on rational arguments in favour of their truth? What could reasonably be said in favour of a God, the author of life, becoming subject to mortality? To his being born, of a woman, though not begot by a man? To his dying the death of a sinner, to atone for the sins of the saints: to his descending into hell and his ascending again to heaven, to reassume, after all, the pristine glory of the Deity!

“If there be any thing, in any religion, more revolting to human reason than this, we are unacquainted with the greatest apparent absurdities in the known world.

“If we are asked then, whether as *mere rational* beings, we can believe such propositions? we frankly answer, no.—And yet, experimentally convinced how short is the line of the human understanding, how inadequate the strongest powers of sense and genius to penetrate the veil of nature and of providence, we can readily submit our reason to revelation, and give our unfeigned assent, as *Christians*, to the truth of propositions, which, as *men* and *philosophers*, we can neither fully understand nor clearly conceive. Believing, though not

on any rational conviction, that *faith*, or as our author properly describes it, an assent to the essential doctrines of Christianity, is a religious duty enjoined every man, who lives under the dispensation of the gospel, we believe, even as *men*, so much of them as we comprehend; persuaded that even what we do not comprehend, would command our belief, if we did, in the same proportion.

"We can unfeignedly do this, even while the *truth*, as it is called, of such mysterious propositions appears doubtful, nay, while even the terms of such propositions appear in part or altogether unintelligible.

"It is a favourite maxim with our modern rationalists, (or as some call them, *divines*) that 'where mystery begins religion ends.' This maxim is, in our opinion, so far from being applicable to the Christian religion, that we think the faith of the Christian applicable chiefly to its mysteries, with which it begins and ends.

"There would indeed be something mysterious in the promulgation even of the morals of Christianity, if we could be brought to believe the practice of them in their declared purity to be in our present state required of us; a practice to diametrically opposite to the gratification of the appetites and passions of human nature, and even to the laws of justice and equity admitted in natural religion.

"To submit to every insult, to return good for evil, to love those that hate us, and wish well to them that despitefully use us," are tenets so contrary as well to our natural impatience of injuries as to our ideas of natural justice, that, however the meek-spirited and grace-endowed individual may adopt them in private practice, no community of Christians ever yet dared to admit them into their system of civil policy.

"As to the faith of the Christian, if it be not exercised on the mysteries of his religion, we see neither use nor merit in his belief. If he believe nothing but what appears rational and probable, nothing but what is evinced by a cloud of witnesses, and carries with it the clearest conviction, in what is it more meritorious than the creed of the sceptic or infidel? for even *they* have their *creed*.

"Because thou hast seen me, (saith our Saviour to Didymus) thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

"We think this text perfectly applicable to such as, like our author, are anxious to prove the divine authority of the Scriptures by rational argument: in doing which, we think them just as ill employed as, this writers says, they would be in pretending to accommodate the scriptural doctrines to our natural ideas of rectitude and truth.

"The well-disposed reader, therefore, submitting his *reason* to *revelation*, and his belief of its divine origin, as well as of its more essential doctrines, to a superior mode of conviction, the influence of grace, would do well patiently to wait the effect of its operation in God's own place and time, and not be importunately anxious for the elucidation of obscurities, which nothing but divine illumination can illustrate."

I only want the Doctor's abilities to turn the whole of these curious paragraphs into ridicule. If he would set about it, he could do it in

one moment. Thrust the *Christian* aside, and the *man* would have a copious field to display that wit which is more "native and endued to the element" of his mind, than the wild unsteady meteor of mystic theology.

But taking it for granted that our author is really serious in all he says about supernatural and irresistible grace, I would beg leave to observe, that he mistakes the meaning of that celebrated assertion—'Where mystery begins, religion ends.' At first sight one would be apt to imagine that it contains a most severe and unwarrantable censure on all who have professed to believe in mysteries; as if a man ceased to be religious the moment he believed or taught them; or as if the introduction of a mystery was the ruin of religion. Doctor *Foster* was the first person that was charged with this assertion, but his meaning was misrepresented or misunderstood. He was not to understand as to accuse all of irreligion who believed in mysteries; nor was it consistent with his good sense or charitable disposition to assert, or even to suppose, that there could be no religion in a system of faith which admitted them. His words are these, 'If you say that you cannot account for the *manner* of God's creating the world; or of the *manner* in which he exists every where; of the general resurrection and the like, I answer, it is no part of your religion to account for it. Where the *mystery* begins, religion ends.' The meaning of this passage is obvious enough. Religion goes hand-in-hand with evidence. Evidence must be something in its own nature level to understanding. What is beyond it is the *secret* thing which belongs to God. A man's religion doth not depend on what his understanding hath nothing to do with. It may possibly be true: but it doth not belong to us in the present sphere of action. For if a thing is out of the reach of my understanding, and comes no way within the circle of sense and experience, but on the contrary strongly militates against both, what judgment can I pass on it? How shall I know whether it be true or false? It may turn out to be the latter as much as the former. Nay, there is a greater probability of its being false; for if it be inconsistent with reason, what have *reasonable* beings to do with it? Of what possible service can it be to them? Was it revealed merely to *try* the faith and patience of man,—to *puzzle* his understanding and to make a man stupid by poring all day on what is absolutely unintelligible? And who can suppose such a revelation to be the fruit of infinite goodness and consummate wisdom?

The Bible is generally called by Christians the standard of truth: but what makes it so? not because it contains unintelligible mysteries, but because it appears to our reason (which must be the ultimate judge) to be the delineation of divine mercy and truth, and best adapted to the imperfections and limited views of the present state. The just and steady conviction of its truth originates from this source. Hence we pay it the honour it claims and deserves. Other religions may lay an equal claim to divine authority, supernatural inspiration, &c. &c. and their blind and passive votaries may take their bare word for it, and perhaps imagine they feel something of their extraordinary power; for what wonders will not fancy perform when let loose upon the mind? but doth the Christian religion require



quire our assent on so doubtful and suspicious a footing? by no means. St. Paul *reasoned* out of the scriptures and exhorted Christians to be well acquainted with the evidences of their faith, that they might give a *reason* of the hope that was in them. It is no reason at all, to appeal to my own convictions produced by supernatural influence. What are these hidden things to another? The reason fit to be produced must be of such a nature, as is calculated to convince the understandings of others: and for that purpose must be conducted on the plain ground of fact and common sense. Our Saviour and his disciples constantly appealed to evidence, and that evidence was an object of mere natural understanding, and remains so still, through all the steps of enquiry and proof; and which, to perceive clearly when offered, needs not the miraculous intervention of the spirit, nor the superaddition of any new and extraordinary illumination. Supposing the gospel to have no external or internal evidence of sufficient force to convince the human mind of its truth, how is it to be preached to the *unbelieving* world? I cannot communicate my feelings to another by some secret sympathetic impulse. I must reason with him on the common principles of human nature; and if arguments of this kind have no effect, I should have but slender hopes of his conversion, from any supernatural interposition. But Dr. Kenrick says, "the influence of grace must be waited for." In what manner? must he pray for this influence? what right hath he to expect it? where are his hopes of receiving it founded? Surely mere nature of itself excites, and encourageth no expectations of this kind. Is he to pray to be convinced of the truth of scripture? this would be prejudging the cause. Is he to read the scriptures as the Doctor did, till his reason convince him that they contain absurdities and contradictions? Is there any hope in the midst of the disgust which would naturally arise from finding a book given out as of divine authority, so totally undeserving of human credit—is there any hope that the Spirit of the Almighty will interpose to convince him by some secret bias upon his understanding, which will overpoise all its natural sentiments, and silence all its reasonable objections by an irresistible and inexpressible impulse? Then surely the written word of God is a needless incumbrance on the church. Prophecies are useless, and miracles were thrown away to very little purpose. All might have been accomplished with greater simplicity, without either the one or the other. Here is internal provision to supply for external defect: an unknown something, from "the Lord knows where." It serves instead of a thousand arguments to enlighten the blind, to reduce the erring, and bend the refractory "to the obedience of faith."

From an impartial review of Dr. Kenrick's observations, I can see no possible advantage that they can be of to the cause which he professeth to maintain, unless he could communicate *grace* with the same facility, that he communicates *entertainment*. If the doctor's object was to strengthen the faith of the Christian, and to convert the Deist from the error of his way, he was certainly mistaken in the means of pursuing it. The rational evidences of the truth of the gospel (to say the least of them) add weight to the conviction of the Christian,

granting that the chief evidence ariseth from the inward witness of the spirit. But spirits are to be tried. Now by what test ought the trial to be conducted? by what characteristics may we with safety determine that they are of God?

Dr. Kenrick hath done every thing that a man of sense and genius could do, to pull down the common supports of the Christian faith. It will be asked, "hath he erected better in their stead?" by no means. He hath builded the house upon the sand—the shifting and unstable foundation of fancy and feeling. The rational Christian hath nothing to rely on:—and the Deist, sees nothing to convince him. For what can he bring, but his own reason to examine into the evidence of faith; and how long he may wait till supernatural grace is imparted to him, to force conviction on his mind, God only knows. Thus, the belief of the Christian is weakened, and the conversion of the Deist left to the hazard of one of the most dubious peradventures in the world.—"But he must wait."—Must he wait in hope? must he attend on ordinances? must he "give himself to reading, meditation, and prayer." These are the means which scripture commands us to make use of, in order to obtain that high blessing, which, according to the Doctor, must be obtained *prior* to our belief of scripture, and consequently must precede our persuasion of the efficacy of those means which the scripture recommends. I know the Doctor's ingenuity can work himself out of difficulties with peculiar adroitness—not with the sneaking, shuffling, quibbling, jesuitical sophistry of John Wesley, and such sort of writers—but with the air and grace of a man of sense and spirit,—and therefore I should be pleased to see how he can acquit himself of his own charge against Mr. Jenyns, viz. "that his arguments hang "on geometry:" for I would ask him "whether, on his system, "the influence of grace is not proved from scripture, and the truth "of scripture from the influence of grace?"

In these remarks, I have attended only to one object. It is indeed one of the capital objects of the author's work, and therefore merited particular attention.—If the Doctor is a Christian by grace, I wish to be one by grace and reason too. I am not disposed to quarrel with the latter, for the sake of the former. I would, if possible, keep them friends, and let them live together in unity—for "a house divided against itself cannot stand."

S. B.

\* \* \* It is difficult to say whether our Editor be more obliged to Mr. B, for his commendations, than disobliged by his censure.—The charges, of having done every thing a man of sense and genius could do, to pull down the common supports of the Christian Faith, and to have set up nothing better in their stead; of publishing observations that can answer no other end than that of propagating infidelity; these charges, we say, are of too serious a nature not to require a refutation; which we doubt not Dr. K. will afford us, when a little more at leisure than at present; and that without having recourse to the adroitness and dexterity of evasion, for which our correspondent gives him so much credit.

W.

T O

TO DOCTOR KENRICK.

SIR,

Having read the two first volumes of the French translation of Shakespeare, by Count Catuelan and Messrs. Le Tourneur and Malherbe, to whose version, I think, the reputation of our favourite bard will be greatly indebted; I was somewhat surprised at the contemptuous treatment, those ingenious translators met with, in the appendix to the last volume of the *Monthly Review*: and this the more especially as I had conceived there was a peculiar propriety in the very passage which the authors of that work have taken upon them to criticise and condemn.—As I do not pretend, however, to a critical knowledge either in the writings of the poet or in the French tongue, I have taken the liberty to address myself to a writer, who has, in his Lectures on Shakespeare and his justly-admired translation of Rousseau's *Eloisa*, given the world such undisputed proof of both.

The critique in question, relates to a passage in the *Tempest* and runs thus:

“It is not only pardonable that they [the Translators] should have fallen into some errors, but rather surprising that they should not have been betrayed into more. On this principle we are not inclined to pass any very heavy censure on the following passage of the *Tempest*:

“As wicked dew, as e'er my mother brush'd  
With *raven's* feather from unwholsome fen,  
Drop on you both!”

*Tombe sur vous deux le serain le plus contagieux tel que sur un marais infect ma mère en amassa jamais avec la plume d'un HIBOU!*

Here Shakespeare's *raven* is, by the Translators, unfortunately metamorphosed into an *owl*.”—

Now, sir, I am in some doubt, whether, strictly speaking, *Hibou* means an *Owl*, and am no less so, if it do, whether Shakespeare really meant the bird, we commonly call a *Raven*.

I have mentioned these doubts to some of my acquaintance, who have caught the same scruples, and will be obliged to you, if it suits with the plan of your *Review*, that you would resolve them.

Inner-Temple,  
Oct. 2, 1776.

Yours, a constant Reader,

J. W.

\*\*\* To oblige this Correspondent, and in justice to the Translators, it should be observed, that those supercilious critics, the *Monthly Reviewers*, have here betrayed their ignorance, both of the French language and their own. By their sagacious distinction between the *raven* and the *owl*, and the metamorphosis of the former into the latter, it seems, they conceived, as our correspondent insinuates, that Shakespeare meant the bird, which they would probably have rendered *corbeau*. But can they think his Translators so very ignorant, as not to know, at least as well as they do, that *corbeau* commonly signifies a *raven*, and *hibou* an *owl*? or do they think them so very careless as to have substituted the one for the other, through inattention? I will venture to say, those gentlemen were neither so careless

nor so ignorant. On the contrary, they seem to have understood the author's language, together with their own, much better than do their critics; for the truth is, that neither did Shakespeare mean the bird commonly called the *raven*, nor does *hibou* mean the common *owl*. Had they looked no farther than *Boyer's Dictionary*, they would have found *hibou* marked with an asterisk, to signify its being a figurative term, meaning *oiseau nocturne*, a *night-bird*. The word *owl* they would also have found denoted in the same Dictionary, by *chat-huant*, *chouette*, *oiseau de nuit*: and not by *hibou*. That most accurate lexicographer, *Ludwig*, in like manner gives us, for *owl*, *chouette*, *chat-huant*, and not *hibou*. *Danet*, it is true, in his Latin Dictionary, in *usum Delphini*, gives us *hibou* for *bubo*; which *Ainsworth*, and others, translate generally *owl*. Indeed the French *hibou*, as well as the German, *ubu*, seems, from its found, to have been derived from the Latin *bubo*. The Germans, however, make the same distinction between the *eule* and the *ubu*, as the English do between the *owl* and the *screech-owl*, the one being a generic and the other a specific term. The German *ubu*, as well as the French *hibou*, is also used for *bug-a-boo*, *hobgoblin*, or any other fantastical, terrific nocturnal object. Again, *Danet*, in giving us the French for the word *strix*, the *ubu*, or *screech-owl*, has *oiseau de nuit*, *chauve-fouris*, *hibou*. But *chauve-fouris* means what the English call a *bat*; so that, if *hibou* and *chauve-fouris* are synonymous, the Reviewers might as well have reproached the Translators for having converted Shakespeare's *raven* into a *bat*, as for having metamorphosed it into an *owl*: in which case, how might not they have triumphed over the blunder—the *feather of a bat*!

It appears plain, however, that the Translators attending judiciously to the sense and imagery of their author, made use of a general term, expressive of a bird of ill-omen, flying in the night; in which, as the dew falls, the feather might drop in its flight. Had they used, therefore, the word *corbeau*, they would have been unfaithful to their author, and have fallen greatly short of the propriety of the original. They very properly, therefore, used *hibou*, signifying the *strix* of the Latins, from the Στρίξ of the Greeks, a *screech-owl* or unlucky bird, the *Lucifer bubo*, as it is styled by *Valerius Maximus* and others; or, perhaps, as properly the νυκτιγοράξ, *nycticorax*, or *night-crow* of the Greeks, Latins and English. For so *Shakespeare* himself calls the *Nacht-raabe*, or *night-raven*, as it is expressly styled by *Milton*.

Where brooding darkness spreads his jealous wings,

And the *night-raven* sings.

L'ALLEGRO.

This is, indeed, the common term in some parts of England, for the bird, called in others the *screech-owl*.

It is plainly the *feather of such a raven* that *Shakespeare* meant in the passage above quoted; which the translators have therefore justly rendered *la plume d'un hibou*.—What now becomes of the curious criticism of the learned *Monthly Reviewers*, and of their affected lenity, in not passing a *very heavy censure* on the Translators, for their misrepresentation of the above passage! Ought not a *very heavy censure* to be passed on *them*, for this piece of insolence and injustice?

And

And ought not they themselves to be exposed to general contempt, for presuming thus to impose on their readers, by an illiterate criticism, equally contemptuous and contemptible?—Not that the public hath much right to complain. *Si mundus vult decipi decipiamur*. What can be expected from *anonymous* authors, uninterested in the credit of their publications; to which they contribute merely for pay, under the direction of Booksellers and Printers, still more mercenary and illiterate than themselves! K.

---

TO THE EDITORS OF THE LONDON REVIEW.

GENTLEMEN,

In your remarks (Dr. Kenrick's, I suppose) on Mr. Jenyns's Enquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil, inserted in your last Review, p. 161, you "boldly defy the greatest philosopher on earth to deduce from natural causes, by the unassisted powers of human reason, one valid proof that God is good." And again, p. 163 "It is certain that even unbelievers have robbed the sacred writings of those very principles which constitute the foundation of their profane systems. Among these are the moral attributes of the Deity, and particularly that of benevolence. Else let them tell us whence they derived the notion of God's goodness?" In answer to this question, tho' no *unbeliever*, it may be sufficient to say, that the idea of the divine goodness was deduced even by the Heathens, who never heard of Christ or the Scriptures, from the visible works of the creation. And for this, besides their own writings still extant, we have the words of an Apostle:—"Though in times past", says St. Paul, God suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." Thus his *doing good*, even in those unenlightened times, was a witness clear and intelligible to all. Rain and fruitful, &c. as not only filled their hearts with food and gladness, but also convinced them of the divine benevolence. And not *one* alone, but *many* valid proofs "that God is good, are deduced from natural causes, by the unassisted powers of human reason," in Cicero's Argument of Balbus, inserted in his treatise *de Natura Deorum*, to which I beg leave to refer you.

And am your constant reader,

QUERIST.

\*\*\* This correspondent seems to forget that the scriptures consist of the Old Testament as well as the New: he does not appear to reflect also how considerable a part of the ancient heathen philosophy was taken from the writings of Moses and the prophets. As to the argument of Cicero on the subject, it is little better than mere declamation.

Our defiance therefore, still remains unretracted, and we are ready to enter the lists with any respectable opponent who will accept the challenge in the way of fair argument, without laying any stress on mere authorities, however classical or venerable.

T O



TO THE EDITOR OF THE LONDON REVIEW.

SIR,

Although it is very far from my wishes, or intentions, to involve you in an altercation with me about your associate, W's. Critique \*, yet can I not rest perfectly satisfied with your defence of it. It is indeed a just remark of yours, that "the credibility, or incredibility of a fact, does by no means affect the truth of it;" but then, on the other hand, it is very possible to make use of the epithet *incredible* in such a manner, as to make it synonymous, or at least convey the same idea, with *untrue*. The thing's incredible! *i. e.* it is false, or, none but fools can credit it: *credat Judæus!* †

I will not be so *unjust* or *uncharitable* as directly to charge Mr. Gibbon, much less your associate, with the same kind of behaviour; but I apprehend, that the cause of christianity, especially in these our days, is very little indebted to either of them for the *manner* in which they have introduced the Roman writers' silence on the darkness of the passion. And to all those, who may have been in the least injured by the insinuation, which it certainly may (whether intentionally on their part or not) convey; to all such—if any such should chance to read this epistle—I beg leave to say once more, that *ceteris paribus*, silence can never be admitted at the tribunals of truth and justice before positive testimony.

But Seneca and Pliny, it may be said, were "persons of credit and capacity," were noblemen and philosophers; whilst Matthew and Mark were held to be the dregs of the people, they were *as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things*. True! and it is no wonder therefore if the former did *despise*, and refuse to be seen in company with the latter, notwithstanding they were ready to, and most probably did, seal their testimony with their blood.

Let us now, if you please, turn back to bishop Hurd. That excellent prelate in his republication of Taylor's Demonstration, &c. had given it some high commendations, which your colleague thinks ill-bestowed; "the premises of almost every conclusion drawn throughout the whole being mere *gratis dicta*." In proof of this criticism, he produces the account which Taylor gives from the evangelists of the preternatural darkness at the passion, and then sets against it what Mr. Gibbon has said of the philosopher's silence about that astonishing event; which renders it, in his opinion, almost incredible. But, what then? "the mere incredibility of a fact does by no means affect the truth of it;" and therefore it were next to absurd to argue about it on that score. Besides, the arguing upon such a fact, as that is, would probably have no other effect than it had in Tertullian's days, of serving to render that which is in itself astonishing, not only almost, but altogether, incredible, and to be at last, perhaps, roundly denied: and therefore  
the

\* See the Correspondence in our last.

† Our correspondent here argues from the popular abuse of words, whereas our associate W. argued from the philosophical and proper use of them. There would be no end of dispute, if a proper distinction were not made between them. Rav.



## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS. 319

the bishop and the doctor, were both right in leaving it to rest, as they found it, on the credibility of the gospel-historians, and your colleague, W's. criticism, is at least superfluous.

I am, Sir

Derby,  
Oct. 14, 1776.

Your constant reader,

J. S.

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

\* \* We are obliged to our sincere friend and well-wisher J. J. of Golden Square; but really cannot reasonably account for his friendship and good wishes to persons, against whom he pretends to have so much cause of complaint.—If he really possesses, however, the modesty he affects, he will not insist either on our altering our plan, or the conduct of it, when he is assured that we can produce the suffrages of most of the *literati* of eminence in this country, in its favour. We cannot consent, therefore, to make any kind of alteration, to humour the whim of less distinguished individuals.—The offence, he takes at the severity, with which we have lately treated our rival reviewers, we are persuaded, would be mitigated, if he knew or reflected that they were the first aggressors; that they first brought the charge of *malignancy* against Mr. Rubrick, and seized every occasion that offered to injure the credit of the *LONDON REVIEW*. It is well known that, for many months, we took not the least notice of the *anonymous Reviews*; a conduct we had determined to pursue, had not their authors began first the attack, and their proprietors put in practice the meanest arts and subterfuges to circumvent the circulation of our work.—Our correspondent is yet mistaken in thinking that circulation so important an object, in the light he represents it. The proprietors of the *London Review*, are neither booksellers nor printers, nor do they stand in so much need of such resources, as the profits arising from the sale of a twelve-penny pamphlet, as he imagines.—As to the propriety of treating our anonymous rivals (as our correspondent recommends) in “the most candid and delicate manner possible;” we do not conceive it. When the *Monthly* and *Critical Reviewers* will stand forth, and by name avow themselves the authors of what they write, we shall behave to them with the respect due to their character and the ingenuousness of their conduct: but till then, we shall treat them like the skulking assassins they have so frequently proved.—In respect to our reputation for *politeness* and *good-breeding*, *polite* terms for *disimulation* and *hypocrisy*, we are very little anxious about it. We shall on all occasions endeavour to have *truth* and *justice* on our side; and then, should either the impudence of ignorance or the impertinence of folly excite our resentment, we shall not hesitate to express it with becoming indignation; relying on the approbation of the judicious, regardless of the censure of those, whose contemptible timidity would shelter the want of sense and spirit under the specious pretext of *candour* and *delicacy*.

K. S. H.

\* \* W

\*.\* We did not mean to offend our correspondent, the Suffolk Seeker; for whose liberal and ingenious communications we entertain a proper respect. He appears, however, to misapprehend the motive for Dr. K's styling Mr. J. an *almost Christian*, when he imputes it to want of charity. The text, chosen for the Observer's motto, was only a retort courteous on that, which had been selected by Mr. J. himself.—As to the severity of our remarks on the Letters of J. B—n, and of this correspondent; we have only to say that when gentlemen, who are not professed critics, but, have time enough on their hands to be exact and correct, take upon themselves to turn hypercriticks, we think it but fair to take every fair advantage of their inattention, to shew them that the task of criticism is not quite so easy as they imagine.

\*.\* We have no objection to expose the wickedness of hypocrisy, especially when it is connected with any species of literary imposture; but, as we have not the pleasure of knowing Mr. John Roberts of Fakenham, we cannot admit such heavy charges, as he brings against a respectable and reverend clergyman, merely on the assertion of a stranger.

\*.\* We are obliged to our correspondent Philo-Kenrick of Cath. Hall, Cambridge; for his hint, which shall be attended to; we shall also take the first opportunity, to give an account of the books and pamphlets he mentions.

\*.\* We are sorry to be again under the necessity of acquainting Dr. N. D. Falck, that we cannot take more particular notice of the dirt that is thrown at us from those literary dung-carts of abuse and falsehood, the Morning-Post and Morning-Chronicle. He may say, *in stercore invenias aurum*; but we leave to the scribbling scavengers of the day the emoluments they may reap, as gold-finders, by raking in such filthy channels.

††† We could not forbear smiling at the pedantic pomp, with which our correspondent *Sanconiathon*, recommends to our attention the Philosophical Transactions, Dr. Bryant's Mythology, and other scientific and learned works, instead of the superficial publications on which, he says, we delight to dwell. We wonder what delight or utility such profound speculations can be of to a man, who mis-spells and makes false concord in almost every sentence.